Forgotten Books

www.forgottenbooks.com

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

A

LETTER

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND

HERBERT,

LORD BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH,

LADY MARGARET'S PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,

ON THE

INDEPENDENCE

OF THE

Authorized Version of the Bible.

BY

HENRY WALTER, B. D. AND F. R. S.

FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; PROFESSOR IN THE EAST INDIA COLLEGE, HERTS; AND CHAPLAIN TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD AND SON,
187, PICCADILLY;
AND J. NICHOLSON, CAMBRIDGE.

1823.

Printed by S. Gosnell, Little Queen Street, London.

ERRATA.

Page 6, line 10, 11, *for* collection, *read*, collation.
13, Note, line 4 from bottom, *for* which from, *read*, from which.
14, Note, *for* Lect. XIX. *read*, Lect. XIV.
15, line 3, *for* eye, *read*, eyes.
—— 4 from bottom, *for* maning, *read*, meaning.
58, Note, line 12, *for* Marsh's, *read*, Masch's.
77, line 19, *for* Ε ϑου, *read*, Εκ ϑου.

1081657

LETTER,

&c.

MY LORD,

WHILST I enjoyed the advantage of attending your Lectures, a painful impression was forced upon me; that I must, for the future, cease to view the authorized Version of the Bible in a higher light than as a secondary translation. Perhaps, however, that impression (heightened as it was by a peculiar and very skilful adjustment of emphasis, adding force to the arguments which your words convey) might be stronger than your Lordship intended. It was the combined effect of your language and manner, which induced me to believe, that Tyndal, our earliest translator in Henry VIII.'s time, instead of translating directly from the original Scriptures, did but compile a version from the Latin Vulgate, and

the German of Luther's Bible; and that our present authorized Version had not been sufficiently purified, from the effect of this transmission of the original through Luther, to deserve the character of an independent translation.

This prejudice adhered to me, with all the weight of your authority, till the practice of reading the Hebrew Pentateuch with Luther's translation, the Vulgate and the Septuagint in adjoining columns, and with the English Bible, of course, at hand, forced upon my attention the fact, that almost every verse afforded satisfactory proof of the independence of the authorized Version. I became, therefore, anxious to know what ground your Lordship had for adopting the depreciatory view, which I supposed you to entertain; of a translation, whose admirable fidelity was daily gaining upon my esteem, whilst I thus continued to compare it with the original and with other versions.

As far as I have been able to collect those grounds; they do not appear to afford a suf-

ficient foundation for that opinion of our translation, which your fourteenth Lecture seems but too likely to diffuse and establish. Allow me, therefore, my Lord, to recall the following passage in that Lecture to your recollection, and respectfully to solicit your attention to my reasons for doubting its accuracy if I rightly understand its scope. Should I be found to have taken a wrong view of your meaning, I shall scarcely regret my mistake, if it induces you to warn those, who will look up to your Lectures for guidance in their studies, against falling into my error.

* "Here the subject requires a few observa-
"tions on our *own* authorized Version. It was
"published by royal authority in the reign of
"James I. having been then compiled out of
"*various* English Bibles, which had been
"printed since the time of the Reformation.
"To judge therefore of our authorized Version,
"we should have some knowledge of those
"*previous* English Bibles. The first of them

"was a translation made abroad, partly by
"Tyndal, and partly by Rogers, but chiefly by
"the former. It was undertaken soon after
"the Reformation commenced in *Germany*,
"and therefore several years before the Re-
"formation was introduced into *England*.
"What knowledge Tyndal had of Hebrew is
"unknown; but he of course understood the
"Latin Vulgate, and he was likewise acquaint-
"ed with *German*. Indeed he passed some
"time with Luther at Wittenberg; and the
"books which Tyndal selected for translation
"into *English*, were always those which Lu-
"ther had *already* translated into *German*.
"Now Luther did not translate according to
"the order in which the several books follow
"each other in the *Bible*: he translated in an
"order of *his own*, and the *same* order was ob-
"served also by Tyndal, who translated *after*
"Luther. We may conclude therefore, that
"*Tyndal's* translation was taken at least *in part*
"from Luther's: and this conclusion is further
"confirmed by the *Germanisms* which it con-
"tains, *some* of which are still preserved in
"our *authorized* Version. Further, when Ro-

"gers had completed what Tyndal left unfi-
"nished, he added notes and prefaces from
"Luther. The translation of the whole Bible,
"thus made by Tyndal and Rogers, was pub-
"lished at Hamburg under the feigned name
"of Matthewe; and hence it has been called
"Matthewe's Bible. Subsequent English edi-
"tions were Coverdale's Bible, Cranmer's Bible
"(called also the great Bible, and sometimes
"by the names of the printers, Grafton and
"Whitchurch), the Geneva Bible, and Parker's
"or the Bishops' Bible, which last was pub-
"lished in 1568, and from that time was used
"in our *Churches* till the introduction of our
"*present* Version. Now the Bishops' Bible, as
"appears from Archbishop Parker's instruc-
"tions, was only a revision of Cranmer's Bible:
"and Cranmer's Bible was only a correction
"(in some places for the worse) of Matthewe's
"Bible, that is, of the translation made by
"Tyndal and Rogers." We see therefore the
"genealogy of the *Bishops'* Bible; and the
"Bishops' Bible was made the *basis* of our pre-
"sent authorized Version." For the first rule,
"given by James the First to the compilers of

" it, was this, 'The ordinary Bible, read in
" Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible,
" to be followed, and as little altered as the
" original would permit.' But whenever Mat-
" thewe's Bible, or Coverdale's, or Whitchurch's,
" or the Geneva Bible, came *nearer* to the
" original (that is, to the editions of the He-
" brew Bible and Greek Testament *then* in use),
" the text of these *other* English Bibles was
" ordered to be adopted. Now, as this collec-
" tion was made by some of the most distin-
" guished scholars in the age of James the First,
" it is probable, that our authorized Version
" is as faithful a representation of the original
" Scriptures as *could* have been formed at *that*
" *period.* But when we consider the immense
" accession which has been *since* made, both to
" our critical and to our philological apparatus;
" when we consider, that the whole mass of
" literature, commencing with the London
" Polyglot, and continued to Griesbach's Greek
" Testament, was collected *subsequently* to that
" period; when we consider that the most im-
" portant sources of intelligence for the *inter-*
" *pretation* of the original Scriptures were *like-*

" *wise* opened after that period, we cannot pos-
" sibly pretend that our authorized Version does
" not require *amendment*. On this subject we
" need only refer to the work of Archbishop
" Newcome, entitled, 'An Historical View of
" the English Biblical Translations; the Ex-
" pediency of revising by Authority our present
" English Translation, and the Means of ex-
" ecuting such a Revision.' Indeed Dr. Mac-
" knight, in the second section of his general
" Preface, goes so far as to say of our autho-
" rized Version, 'It is by no means such a just
" representation of the inspired originals, as
" merits to be implicitly relied on, for deter-
" mining the controverted articles of the Chris-
" tian faith, and for quieting the dissensions
" which have rent the Church.'"

Now, my Lord, I am by no means disposed to pretend that our authorized Version might not be improved; nor am I inclined to assert that it is "such a just representation of the in-
"spired originals as merits to be implicitly re-
" lied on for determining any controverted
" articles of the Christian faith." No reason-

able inquirer would rely implicitly even on a perfect translation, in examining controverted points, if he could consult the originals; because, though a certain English word may be an accurate representative of a certain Greek word, in the sense in which it is employed in a particular text, yet that English word will also have other meanings, some of which will not, in all probability, be synonimous with the Greek. He, therefore, who can look into the original, will sometimes learn that precise meaning which the English word must be confined to in the text under examination. It is almost certain that he will be able to reject some of the meanings which might have attached to the word, had it been found in an original English author. Persons very moderately skilled in criticism are yet capable of perceiving, that a Greek or Hebrew word, and its English representative, are not synonimous in all their bearings; and it is the power of ascertaining this limitation to their resemblance, which constitutes the chief value and utility of such a knowledge of the original languages employed by the inspired writers, as

ninety-nine students in divinity, out of the hundred are, with respectable industry, enabled to obtain. Few will have a right to feel confident, that they can ascertain, with perfect precision, the accuracy with which our English Version renders difficult passages; still fewer can hope, without presuming too much, that they shall be able to form a more correct view than our learned and industrious translators did, of the meaning of obscure texts; yet there will be no improper presumption in any person's supposing, that, if he compares the original with an excellent translation, so as to make each throw a light upon the other, he will take a more reasonable course than by stopping short in his search, and relying implicitly on the perusal of the translation alone.

But however nugatory I may consider Dr. Macknight's conclusion, I might well be contented to leave the world impressed with that favourable opinion of our English Bible, which your Lordship has given; where you say, "It "is probable that our authorized Version is as "faithful a representation of the original Scrip-

"tures as could have been formed at that "period." But my fear is, that your readers will not think such a compliment deserved; coming, as it does, immediately after a statement which seemed a fit foundation for a very different conclusion. Details, derogating from the character of that translation, which the English Church has so long sanctioned and employed, will have double weight as coming from a Divine who is known to have paid particular attention to biblical criticism; and from a Prelate whose zeal for the Establishment no one will venture to dispute. It will, not unreasonably, be supposed that your account of the origin of our English Bible, is one which it must have been so painful to your Lordship to proclaim, that the conviction of its correctness must have been forced upon you by the most indisputable evidence; whilst it will be thought no more than natural that your wish to speak favourably of the authorized Version should have led you to close that account with more commendatory language than a less friendly critic would have employed. I am seriously afraid, that too many readers will rise from the perusal

of your statement with an opinion that our English Bible is nothing better than a compilation of a series of second-hand translations. Yet I shall hope to prove that the earliest of the translators referred to produced no second-hand version; but I first wish to remark, that the depreciatory tone in which the words *compiled*, *revision* and *correction*, are all evidently used by your Lordship, is not calculated to give so creditable an opinion of the result of these revisions as it might well deserve; particularly as no person can imagine that these revisions were so many examinations as to its consistency with the German or Vulgate only, even if the accuracy of that *genealogy* which you have traced out for succeeding translations was conceded. You say, "the Bishops' Bible was *only* a revi-"sion of Cranmer's;" and the latter "*only* a "correction of Matthewe's Bible;" the revision might have been conducted with more critical skill, and the corrections might have been more numerous; but is it quite certain, my Lord, that it would have been better to translate entirely de novo than to correct and revise the previous translations? If any person wished to

give the public as correct a translation as possible of Pliny's Letters, I do not see any method by which he would be so likely to attain that end, as by taking Melmoth's translation for a basis; *revising* it; and *correcting* every expression which did not give the precise meaning of the original. Such a method is not ordinarily pursued, because even translators wish, in general, to make a reputation for themselves; or they fancy that they can put the translation into better language than their predecessors have done. But if a person had no other object than to produce an *accurate* translation, I do not see how he could proceed with more likelihood of success, than by limiting his alterations to the correction of a previous translator; supposing that translator's general style to be such as could not reasonably be excepted against. He would be free from an author's predilection for his own modes of expression; he would merely consider how far any sentence did accurately represent the meaning of the original; and he would leave it undisturbed, or correct it accordingly.

This method would evidently be still more judicious, where an old translation had become popular; and particularly if it was wished that those who were intimate with the old should readily comprehend, and have no needless pretext allowed them for rejecting, any reference to the new translation. If our present Version had a hundred errors, where it has one, who would not prefer having those errors carefully corrected to having the language entirely recast*

Indeed of what is it that your Lordship speaks at the conclusion of this very Lec-

* I am happy to be able to quote, on this topic, the authority of the late learned and excellent Bishop of Calcutta; who has said, "The general fidelity of our English transla-
" tion has never been questioned, and its style is incompa-
" rably superior to any thing which might be expected from
" the finical and perverted taste of our own age. It is
" simple; it is harmonious; it is energetic; and, which is
" of no small importance, use has made it familiar, and time
" has rendered it sacred." Middleton on the Gr. Art, p. 318.

Let it be remembered too, that this evidence is given in favour of a version, which from Dr. Middleton's anxiety to build important arguments on certain apparently minute variations in the language of the original, does not receive the sanction that he must have wished it should.

ture, as a thing that may be desirable, but of "again *revising* by authority our English Ver-"sion*?". And if, in the course of such a revi-sion, it received every correction which the ad-ditions made in modern times "to our critical "and philological apparatus" could suggest; would you not think it hypercriticism to object to this improved translation, that was *only a re-vision*, or *only a correction*, of the present English Bible? To all useful ends this would be a *new* translation; its authority would depend upon the opinion which the public might form of the learning and judgment with which the correc-tions were made; but the serious evil would be avoided, of deranging all the early religious impressions of the lower class of readers or hearers by a total change of language.

I must beg leave, therefore, my Lord, to contend that our present authorized Version, as made under the auspices of King James, was a *new* translation; *new* to as great an extent as improvement was desirable and practicable; yet

* Lect. XIX. p. 41.

free from all ambitious and useless novelty; being composed by scholars, ripe and good ones; who "were greater in other men's eyes "than in their owne, and that sought the trueth "rather then their owne prayse." They were called together by the King not to act the part of mere *compilers*; but "for the translation of "the Bible *." The directions or restrictions imposed upon them amounted to nothing more than the establishment of this very excellent principle; that, as the language of the translations already in use was become familiar to the people, that language should be preserved as far as it could with propriety; but certainly no farther than might be compatible with a correct representation of the inspired original. The preservation of the old English text was not to interfere with their task of ascertaining, and expressing, the maning of the original as accurately as they could.

In the translators' prefatory address to the readers, drawn up by one of their body (Dr.

* See the King's letter to Archbishop Bancroft. Whittaker's Enquiry, p. 70.

Miles Smith, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester), they say, "His Majesty having bethought him-"self of the good that might ensue by a *new* "*translation*, presently after gave order for *this* "translation, which is now presented unto thee." In this same preface it is objected to the Italic versions, made before Jerome's time, that "they were not out of the Hebrew fountain "(we speak of the Latin translations of the "Old Testament), but out of the Greek stream; "therefore, the Greek being not altogether "clear, the Latin derived from it must needs be "muddy." Now, it would have been indeed carping at the mote in their brother's eye, whilst they perceived not the beam in their own, had they made this objection, when conscious that the work, which they themselves were now sending out to the world as the new translation required by their Sovereign, was but a collation from derived streams; that they had stopped short of the fountain-head. And yet we find them saying soon after, "Truly, good Christian "reader, we never thought from the beginning, "that we should need to make a *new* transla-"tion, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one;

" but to make a good one better, or out of many
" good ones one principal good one, not justly
" to be excepted against; that hath been our
" endeavour, that our mark. To that purpose
" there were many chosen, that were greater in
" other men's eyes then in their owne, and that
" sought the trueth rather then their owne
" prayse." Now, if they meant by this language to announce, that they had done no more than select a good translation from the versions of Tyndal, Coverdale, Cranmer, and others, their objection to the old Italic translation was extremely hypocritical; and the title-page of their own Bible bore upon its face a most disgraceful falsehood *.

I am sure your Lordship believes them to have been truly honest and pious men. We must not, therefore, attach any such meaning to the above quotation. The passage in question can only be explained, consistently with other parts of the preface, by supposing it to

* The Holy Bible containing the Old Testament and the New: newly translated out of the original Tongues: and with the former Translations diligently compared and revised.

mean, that the previous translations were not so bad as to require that every text should be rendered anew; that, on the contrary, they were so good that the present translators began their work with the expectation that they should have but little to add to what had been already done, by some one or other of their predecessors; and as it was probable, that any great changes of language would not be found necessary; and desirable, that they should not be made if unnecessary; such persons had been selected as were unambitious of praise; in order, that if they found any passage correctly translated already, they might not be tempted to alter the words merely for the sake of appropriating to themselves the credit which would otherwise attach to former translators.

But if there is good ground for arguing à priori, that such is the real meaning of the modest language used by King James's translators; and that we should construe it too unfavourably, if we accepted it as a confession, that they had acted the part of mere compilers from other versions; this argument is most decisively con-

firmed by the concluding portion of the same paragraph of the preface. "If you ask," says Dr. Smith, speaking of himself and his col-leagues, "what they had before them, truly it "was the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, "the Greeke of the New. These are the two "golden pipes, or rather conduits, where-"through the olive branches emptie themselves "into the golde. Saint Augustine calleth them "precedent, or originall tongues; Saint Hie-"rome, fountaines. The same Saint Hieroime "affirmeth, and Gratian hath not spared to put "it into his decree, That as the credite of the "Olde Bookes (he meaneth of the Old Testa-"ment) is to bee tryed by the Hebrewe volumes, "so of the New by the Greeke tongue, he "meaneth by the originall Greeke. If trueth "be to be tried by these tongues, then *whence* "*should a translation be made, but out of them?* "*These tongues, therefore, the Scriptures, wee* "*say, in those tongues, we set before us to trans-*"*late,* being the tongues wherein God was "pleased to speake to his Church by his Pro-"phets and Apostles. Neither did we run over

"the worke with that posting haste that the
"Septuagint did, if that be true which is re-
"ported of them, that they finished it in
"seventy-two dayes; neither were we barred or
"hindered from going over it againe, having
"once done it, like St. Hierome, if that be true
"which himself reporteth, that he could no
"sooner write any thing but it was presently
"caught from him, and published, and he
"could not have leave to mend it; neither, to
"be short, were we the first that fell in hand
"with translating the Scripture into English,
"and consequently destitute of former helpes,
"as it is written of Origen, that he was the
"first in a manner, that put his hand to write
"commentaries upon the Scriptures, and there-
"fore no marvaile if he overshot himselfe many
"times. Neither did we thinke much * to con-

* An old English expression for thinking it too great a burden—more than could be required.

He clad
Their nakedness with skins of beasts, or slain;
Or as the snake with youthful coat repaid,
And thought not much to clothe his enemies.

Paradise Lost, book x. 216.

" sult the translators or commentators, Chaldee;
" Hebrew, Syrian, Greeke, or Latine; no, nor
" the Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch; nei-
" ther did we disdaine to revise that which we
" had done, and to bring back to the anvill that
" which wee had hammered; but having and
" using as great helpes as were needful, and
" fearing no reproch for slownesse, nor covet-
" ing praise for expedition, we have at the
" length, through the good hand of the Lord
" upon us, brought the worke to that passe that
" you see."

Now, surely, my Lord, no reader of your Lectures would be led by them to imagine, that the persons, who formed our authorized Version, could justly give such an account as this of their labours. Either this statement is untrue, or so excellent and judicious a mode of proceeding is not described in terms calculated to give a correct notion of it, where you say, "The au-
" thorized Version was published by royal au-
" thority in the reign of James the First, hav-
" ing been then *compiled* out of various English

"Bibles which had been printed since the time
"of the Reformation *."

If your Lordship feels inclined to suspect that the statement, contained in the translators' preface, gives too high an account of the pains taken with the authorized Version, it has in its favour the most unexceptionable testimony that can well be imagined, in the following remarks of Selden: "The English translation of the "Bible is the best translation in the world, and "renders the sense of the original best, taking "in for the English translation, the Bishops' "Bible, as well as King James'. The transla-"tors in King James's time took an excellent "way. That part of the Bible was given to "him who was most excellent in such a tongue "(as the Apocrypha to Andrew Downs), and "then they met together, and one read the "translation, the rest holding in their hands "some Bible, either of the learned tongues, or "French, Spanish, Italian, &c.; if they found "any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on."

* Lect. XIV. p. 33.

"There is no book so translated as the Bible "for the purpose. If I translate a French "book into English, I turn it into English "phrase, not into French English. Il fait froid, "I say, 'T is cold, not It makes cold; but the "Bible is rather translated into English words "than into English phrase. The Hebraisms "are kept, and the phrase of that language is "kept *."

Now these remarks do not appear to have been made under the bias of a man controverting any disputed point. They are given incidentally in his Table Talk, amongst a variety of other topics. I need not tell your Lordship that this is the testimony of a most learned and laborious man, who had paid distinguished attention to Hebrew literature; who, from the time when he lived, and the course of his studies, must have had opportunities of questioning King James's translators as to the way in which they had proceeded with their great work; and who was notoriously but little disposed to give unmerited

* Selden's Table Talk, art. Bible.

praise, or to acquiesce in any doubtful claim for reputation set up by the Church of England.

My friend Mr. Whittaker's evidence, as to the method pursued by King James's translators, cannot be cited as equally clear from all suspicion of partiality, because his object in writing was something like my own; yet what he has said on this question is the evident result of extensive research after such scattered details as can now be collected, with regard to the history of the persons employed, and their manner of proceeding *.

"According to these regulations," says he, speaking of the King's instructions, "each book "passed the scrutiny of all the translators suc-"cessively. In the first instance, each indivi-"dual translated every book which was allotted

* See page 78 of An historical and critical Enquiry into the Interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures, by J. W. Whittaker, M. A.

Besides the advantage which I derive from the information that Mr. W. has placed at length before his readers, his references have served me as a clue to several facts, the authority for which I should otherwise have found it very difficult to discover.

" to his division. Secondly, the readings to be
" adopted were agreed upon, by the whole of
" that company assembled together, at which
" meeting each translator must have been solely
" occupied by his own version. The book thus
" finished was sent to each of the other compa-
" nies to be again examined, and at these meet-
" ings it probably was, that, as Selden informs
" us, one read the translation, the rest holding in
" their hands some Bible, either of the learned
" tongues, or French, &c. They also had the
" power of calling in to their assistance any
" learned men, whose studies enabled them to
" be serviceable, when an urgent occasion of
" difficulty presented itself. At the expiration
" of three years, copies of the whole Bible thus
" translated and revised were sent to London;
" one from Oxford, one from Cambridge, and
" a third from Westminster. Here a committee,
" consisting of six, two being deputed by the
" companies at Oxford, two by those at Cam-
" bridge, and two coming from Westminster,
" revised and polished the whole work. Lastly,
" Dr. Smith, the author of the preface, and Dr.
" Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, revised it
" afresh."

Our translators then profess, and were believed by Selden, to have gone through nearly the whole range of biblical criticism, such as it then existed, in order to make their version, what it would not otherwise have deserved to be called, "as faithful a representation of the "original Scriptures as could have been formed "at that period." But if your Lordship should still doubt, notwithstanding these professions, and Mr. Whittaker's account of their admirable arrangements, whether all this criticism went farther than forming a compilation out of the "various English Bibles" which existed before, it is fortunate that some papers left by one of your learned predecessors, still remain as incontestable evidence, that the critical inquiries of King James's translators were not conducted on so limited a scale. Samuel Ward, of Emmanuel College, afterwards Master of Sidney, and Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, had for his own share in forming the authorized Version, the comparatively unimportant task of translating the Apocrypha, or a portion of it, with Downs, above mentioned, and others. A very creditable specimen of the pains he took to

translate his own share accurately has lately been given to the public *. But, besides his peculiar share, it was incumbent on each translator, as Mr. Whittaker observes, to look carefully over the whole; and amongst Dr. Ward's remaining papers is a collation of the following versions of the six first chapters of the book of Genesis, viz. the Chaldee, the Greek, the Vulgate, Pagninus and Tremellius in Latin; an English, a French, and an Italian translation †.

I am sure you will allow, that this was an excellent preparation for revising what his colleagues were to lay before him; and that it was infinitely better than merely collating the previous English translations. Yet I do still hope to convince your Lordship, that even those translations were not of that inferior, secondary class to which your Lectures taught me to consider them as belonging.

* In Mr. Todd's Life of Brian Walton, vol. i. note to page 120. I am indebted to the same source for the fact which follows.

† Note to page 121.

This is the point to which I now wish to come; for, since you may be understood to mean, that as the older English versions were derived from Luther and the Vulgate, instead of being made from the Hebrew, the whole turn of their style must have been so deflected by this double transmission, that no revision or correction could mould such materials into as close a copy as would be desirable of the sacred original; I think it important to the character of our present translation to show, that there existed no such objection to incorporating the language of the older versions. Besides, if it can be proved, as I trust it may, independently of their own assertions, that Tyndal and most of his successors examined the Hebrew text for themselves, instead of being obliged to receive it through the medium of others, it is but due to their characters to show, that their positive assertions were neither false nor exaggerated. Indeed, except for the necessity of defending themselves by a reference to the very words of the inspired writers, if any should object to them, that their translations differed from what they read in the Vulgate, these fathers of the

Reformation ,were not desirous to say inuch of the closeness with which they had endeavoured to copy the sacred original; for they knew that the people had been taught by their priests, to consider the Vulgate as better authority than either the Hebrew or the Greek. The Romish clergy, at that time particularly, depreciated the Hebrew text as written in the language; and deserted to the care of enemies; and the Greek, as the text and language of schismatics; whilst they held out that the purity of the Latin text was ensured by the sanction of an infallible church. The dread of alarming their readers, and of rendering their translations unpopular, by mentioning how much they had been obliged to differ from the Vulgate *, inclined the old English translators to

* When Coverdale wishes to defend the deviations of himself and Tyndal from the Vulgate, he cautiously throws the blame upon the defects of modern editions of the Vulgate, as distinct from the question of its original merits.

" For inasmuch as in our other translations we do not follow
" this old Latin text word for word, they cry out upon us; as
" though all were not as nigh to translate the Scripture out
" of other languages, as to turn it out of the Latin; or as
" though the Holy Ghost were not the author of his Scripture
" as well in the Hebrew, Greek, French, Dutch, as in
" Latin. Now, as concerning this present text in Latin,

undervalue their own labours rather than draw too much attention to the improvements for which they deserved credit. Had they claimed that credit to any thing like the extent to which it was due, I should not have needed now to prove, that they formed a thoroughly independent judgment of the true meaning of the original text, taking other translators as their guides, even in the most difficult passages, only when after inquiry they were induced to form, in fact, the same opinion as the translators whom they may appear to copy. The prudence of not vaunting how much nearer they had come to the original than the Vulgate did, was strongly felt by persons who desired rather to lead their countrymen to study the Scriptures, in any form that was intelligible and palatable to them, than to make a great reputation to themselves as learned men. It

"forasmuch as it hath been, and is yet so greatly corrupt,
"as I think none other translation is, it were a godly and
"a gracious deed, if they that have authority, knowledge,
"and time, would examine it better after the most antient
"interpreters, and most true texts of other languages."—
Coverdale's Dedication of 'Hollybushe's New Testament,
from a copy in Trin. Coll. Library, Cambridge.

was with this feeling that Coverdale published, in 1538, an English translation of the New Testament professedly made from the Vulgate *. He did this three years after he had

* "The Newe Testament, both in Latine and Englishe, "eche correspondent to the other after the vulgare Text com- "monely called St. Jerome's. Faithfully translated by Johan "Hollybushe."

I do not quite understand the object of Coverdale in placing the name of Hollybushe on the title-page of this Testament, and prefixing that of Thomas Mathewe to the Bible. Those title-pages are immediately followed by dedications and prefaces signed Myles Coverdale; in which he does not affect to conceal that the works are his; for example, in the dedication of Hollybushe's New Testament to Henry VIII. Coverdale says, in his own name; "To come now to "the original and first occasion of this my most humble la- "bour, and to declare how little I have, or do intend to "despise this present translation in Latin, I have set it "forth and the English also thereof, I mean the text which "commonly is called St. Hierome's, and is costumably read "in the Church. And this (my most gracious Sovereign) "have I done not so much for the clamorous importunity of "evil speakers, as to satisfy the just request of certain Your "Grace's faithful subjects: and especially to induce and "instruct such as can but English, and are not learned in "the Latin, that in comparing these two texts together they "may the better understand the one by the other. And I "doubt not but such ignorant bodies as (having cure and "charge of souls) are very unlearned in the Latin tongue, "shall through this small labour be occasioned to attain unto "more knowledge, and at the least be constrained to say "well of the thing which heretofore they have blasphemed."

compiled (for I have no objection to the application of the term *compiler* to Coverdale) a much better translation, which stands in the Bible that goes by his name; and a year after he had published Tyndal's translation of the New Testament, made immediately from the Greek; so truly was Coverdale "willing and "ready," as he tells the King in the dedication just quoted, to do his best to serve the cause of religion, "as well in one translation as in "another." Persons who disliked, or scrupled to read the previous and more accurate versions which he had published, might yet, he thought, be induced to look into the Scriptures, when presented to them in a shape at which their priests could scarcely cavil; and might thus receive that salutary instruction, which they would otherwise have shrunk from accepting.

But however useful Coverdale's translations might be, and doubtless were, in alluring our forefathers to the study of the Scriptures, they had been gradually, but almost entirely removed from the English Bible, before King

James's translators commenced their task. It is with Tyndal that the genealogy of our authorized Version begins. Coverdale's name stands on the roll much like that of a person who, dying childless, is counted in the list of predecessors, but not properly amongst the ancestors, of those who in the course of time inherit his title. The description, however, and the fate of Coverdale's Bible will be mentioned with more propriety after some farther notice of Tyndal. My present inquiry shall be, therefore, whether Tyndal was capable of translating immediately from the Hebrew. If I can prove that he was; and that he actually did employ himself in proceeding with a translation from the Hebrew, till his persecutors imprisoned and put him to death; few will think it likely, that, professing to translate the New Testament from the Greek, he was in reality obliged to do it through the medium of the German and Latin Vulgate. For though the knowledge of Hebrew was not then so much more rare than the knowledge of Greek, as it has since become, yet no Christian, probably, attempted to learn

Hebrew, without having previously studied the language of the New Testament *.

Your Lordship has consulted Macknight; and he says, "It is generally believed, that "neither Tyndal nor Coverdale understood "Hebrew †." If you had thought with him, that such a belief was general, you would not,

* Dr. Macknight having persuaded himself, upon the most erroneous grounds, that Tyndal translated even the New Testament from the Latin only, has yet felt obliged to concede, that "*if*, as Lewis informs us, Tyndal translated "an oration from Isocrates, he must have had some know-"ledge of Greek."—General Preface to translation of Epistles, § 2. Note.

The accuracy of Lewis's information is not mere matter of conjecture. In one of Tyndal's prefaces he tells his readers, that his love of study and anxiety for information were so unpopular with the ignorant Romish clergy of the country, that having read Erasmus's flattering description of Bishop Tonstal, he determined to seek for a protector in that prelate. "So I gate me to London, and thorowe the accoyntaunce of "my master came to Sir Harry Gilford, and brought him an "oration of Isocrates, which I had translated out of Greke "into English, and desired him to speak unto my Lord of "London, which he also did."—Tyndal's Pref. to Pentateuch. Edition 1530.

I have verified many of the references and quotations in Lewis's History of the English Translations of the Bible, and in one trifling instance only have I found him incorrect.

† Gen. Pref. § 2, note, p. 15, 2d edit. vol. i.

I should suppose, have taken pains, by an ingenious arrangement of circumstantial evidence, to establish a conclusion which, after all, rather expresses a doubt whether Tyndal knew Hebrew, than a belief that he did not. But leniently as that conclusion is expressed, "that "Tyndal's translation was taken at least in "part from Luther's," your Lordship is too skilful a writer not to be aware, that you have combined circumstances enough to convince any person, who does not dispute your statement of facts, that Tyndal could only venture to desert the Vulgate when he followed the steps of Luther; and that his translation belongs, therefore, to that class usually called secondary.

But let me not misrepresent your Lordship. The passage of which I speak is this:

"To judge, therefore, of our authorized "Version, we should have some knowledge of "those *previous* English Bibles. The first of "them was a translation made abroad, partly "by Tyndal, and partly by Rogers, but chiefly

"by the former. It was undertaken soon after
" the Reformation commenced in *Germany*, and
" therefore several years before the Reformation
" was introduced into *England*. What know-
" ledge Tyndal had of Hebrew is unknown;
" but he of course understood the Latin Vul-
" gate; and he was likewise acquainted with
" *German*. Indeed he passed some time with
" Luther at Wittenberg; and the books, which
" Tyndal selected for translation into *English*
" were always those, which Luther had *already*
" translated into *German*: Now Luther did
" not translate according to the order in which
" the several books follow each other in the
" *Bible*; he translated in an order of *his own*,
" and the *same* order was observed also by
" Tyndal, who translated *after* Luther. We
" may conclude therefore that *Tyndal*'s trans-
" lation was taken at least *in part* from Lu-
" ther's: and this conclusion is further con-
" firmed by the *Germanisms* which it contains,
" *some* of which are still preserved in our *au-*
" *thorized* Version. Further, when Rogers had
" completed what Tyndal left unfinished, he
" added notes and prefaces from Luther. The

" translation of the whole Bible, thus made by
" Tyndal and Rogers, was published at Ham-
" burg under the feigned name of Matthewe;
" and hence it has been called Matthewe's
" Bible. Subsequent English editions were Co-
" verdale's Bible," &c.

Now, my Lord, it would be only cavilling to observe, that Coverdale's was the first of these previous English Bibles; because, though it undoubtedly was so, yet Tyndal led the way amongst these translators, beginning with the New Testament, which he published in 1526. Yet I was exceedingly perplexed to ascertain, what could have led you to speak of Coverdale's Bible, which was printed in 1535, as subsequent to Matthewes's, which was published in 1537, till I accidentally learnt, from another work of your Lordship's, that you had consulted Johnson on these topics *. On looking into his tract, I found, in p. 72, a paragraph commencing as follows: " Anno 1537, the Bible

* Anthony Johnson, M. A. His " Historical Accoun of the several English Translations of the Bible," has been reprinted in the third volume of Bishop Watson's Collection.

"containing the Old and New Testament, "called Matthewes's Bible, of Tyndal's and "Rogers's translation, came forth. It was "printed by Grafton and Whitchurch, at Ham-"borough."

Here Matthewes's Bible is the first announced; whilst the mention of Coverdale's Bible comes in afterwards, parenthetically as it were, in the middle of the paragraph, and was easily overlooked. He has there said, "William Tyndal, with the help of Miles Cover-"dale, had translated part of then Bible, and "what they did had been printed anno 1532. "The whole was finished and printed, anno "1535, with a dedication to King Henry VIII. "by Miles Coverdale (Tyndal being then in "prison), and was called Coverdale's Bible."

Perhaps the more formal and regular announcement of Matthewes's Bible may have arisen from its being, sometimes, considered as the first *authorized* Bible. Cranmer had, with the help of Lord Cromwell, obtained permission to have the words, "Set forth with the

"King's most gracious lycence," inserted in the title-page. Coverdale's Bible was not sanctioned in the same manner on its first appearance; yet he had ventured to dedicate it to the King; and, in 1536, Lord Cromwell's seventh injunction to the clergy, issued by him as the King's Vicegerent, required, "That every per-
"son or proprietary of any parish churche
"within this realme, shall on this side the feast
"of St. Peter ad Vincula next comming, pro-
"vide a boke of the *whole Bible*, both in Laten
"and also in *English*, and lay the same in the
"quire for every man that will to loke and read
"thereon *." There was then no other English Bible but Coverdale's, which was therefore hereby authorized in fact, if not by name.

I have some fears that this misapprehension, as to which was the first English Bible, may occasion my being mistaken with regard to the translation which you intend to assign to Tyndal and Rogers. If I am, your Lordship will pardon me: but, indeed whereas you say, "The

* Fox's Acts, p. 524, col. 1. ed. 1.

" first of the previous English Bibles was a " translation made abroad, partly by Tyndal " and partly by Rogers, but chiefly by the " former*;" I cannot think that Rogers has any right to share so largely with Tyndal the honour of being one of the first translators. Johnson, in the passage quoted above, has certainly called Matthewes's Bible, the translation of Tyndal and Rogers; but in almost the next sentence he lowers Rogers's claims very considerably, merely saying, " The corrector of the " press was John Rogers, a learned divine." Of this I shall, however, beg leave to say more presently.

Your next words are, " It was undertaken " soon after the Reformation commenced in " Germany, and therefore several years before " the Reformation was introduced into Eng- " land†."

I don't understand your Lordship's intention in observing that the translation, to which

* Lect. XIV. p. 33. † Ibid.

you allude, was undertaken "several years be-
"fore the Reformation was introduced into
"England;" unless you mean that the state of religious knowledge amongst the English was so backward compared with Germany, that our translators were scarcely competent to form a correct view of the meaning of the inspired writers without the aid of Luther: It was certainly several years before the Reformation was *established* in England; but if we are considering the effect produced in the way of removing ignorance and prejudices, it may surely be said that the Reformation was *introduced* into England nearly one hundred and fifty years before, when Wickliffe began the restoration of the primitive doctrines of Christianity. At any rate it appears that some of our countrymen, who were examined before Archbishop Warham at Knole in 1511, had already advanced beyond Luther in correctness of opinion on some religious questions *.

* See the Articles which they were required to abjure, in Burnet's History of the Reformation, B. 1. p. 27. 1. Fol. Edition.

Whilst alluding to Luther, as having failed to correct his

Now this was six years before Luther began the Reformation in Germany; fifteen years before Tyndal translated the New Testament, and twenty-four years before Coverdale's Bible came out: early creed so thoroughly as the English Reformers did on the subject of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, I cannot help expressing my surprise at the language used by a most respectable scholar in a late publication, which is very likely to become popular in places of education. I mean a Sketch of ancient and modern Geography, by Dr. Butler of Shrewsbury; in which the Section on the Religions of Europe begins with these words, "The Church of England is *commonly called* "a Lutheran Church; but whoever compares it with the Lu- "theran churches on the continent, will have reason to con- "gratulate himself on its superiority." And soon after follows, "other Lutheran Churches are those of Norway, &c." Now, the great division of the Protestant churches of Europe is into the Lutheran and the Reformed churches. Dr. Butler's scholars, when they consult ecclesiastical historians, will search in vain for the Church of England under the former denomination: and they would be surprised at reading what Mosheim, himself a Lutheran divine, mentions as a proof of moderation in the seventeenth century: "It is "also known, that in several places where Lutheranism was "established, the French, German, and British members of "the Reformed Church were allowed the free exercise of "their religion." Eccles. Hist. vol. v. Part ii. chap. 2. § 1.

There may be many points of doctrine on which we agree more nearly with Luther than with other Reformers of a different school; but it is the acceptance or rejection of the doctrine of consubstantiation, which is mainly decisive as to the designation of Lutheran or Reformed.

"What knowledge Tyndal had of Hebrew "is unknown; but he of course understood the "Latin Vulgate, and he was likewise ac- "quainted with German *."

I should have thought, my Lord, that Tyndal's translation of so much of the Old Testament, afforded proofs enough that he was no indifferent Hebrew scholar. But you would probably say, that I begged the question in assuming that Tyndal made his translation from the Hebrew. And, yet, he himself appeals to the correspondence of his version with the Hebrew as the fair test of its merit. "I submit "this book," says he, "to be disallowed and "also burnt if it seem worthy, when they have "examined it with the Hebrew †." But, perhaps, the evidence of his knowledge of Hebrew, which arises incidentally, may be considered as less liable to suspicion, than a challenge, which it may be thought he knew his adversaries to be incapable of accepting. Now,

*. Lect. XIV. p. 33.

† Tyndal's Preface to the Pentateuch, date 1530. From a copy in the British Museum.

in the same preface Tyndal has this passage: "The Prophet sayth, Psalme cxviii. Thou hast "commanded thy laws to be kept *meod*; that "is, in Hebrew, exceedyngly, with all dili- "gence, might, and power." This quotation is, as might be expected*, from the cxixth Psalm, and is the fourth verse,

אתה צויתה פקדיך לשמר מאד

* "The Psalms proceed in the same order, both in the "Hebrew and LXX; but the two Psalms which are called "the 9th and 10th in the Hebrew, are joined together and "make but one Psalm in the LXX. Hereby it comes to pass, "that, what is called the 11th Psalm in the Heb. and our "English Bibles, is but the 10th in the LXX. And so they "proceed, the LXX still numbering every Psalm one less "than the Hebrew, until you come to the 113th according to "the LXX, or 114th according to the Hebrew; and there- "the LXX again join that and the next Psalm also into "one; whereby the 116th, according to the Hebrew, is but "the 114th according to the LXX. But the LXX ends "that 114th or 116th Psalm with the ninth verse; and the "tenth verse, according to the Hebrew, begins 115th "Psalm according to the LXX. So that from thenceforth "the Hebrew numbers are but one more than those of the "LXX as they were before, and in that manner they con- "tinue to proceed to Psalm 146 according to the LXX, 147 "according to the Hebrew. There the LXX conclude the "Psalm with the twelfth verse, and begin their 147th Psalm "with what is the 13th verse in the Hebrew; and so the "three last Psalms as well as the eight first are numbered "alike in both. The division of the Psalms also in the La-

Septuagint, Σὺ ἐνετείλω τας ἐντολας σου, του φυλαξασθαι σφοδρα.

Vulgate, Tu mandasti mandata tua custodiri nimis.

Luther, Du hast geboten fleissig zu halten deine befehle.

It is obvious from inspection that Tyndal has here neither followed the Vulgate, nor Luther; the former employing the improper word nimis for meod, and the latter using a word which your Lordship will not, perhaps,

" tin Vulgate is the same as in the LXX: So that all
" Christian authors, from the beginning to the Reformation,
" when they have quoted any Psalm by its number, have quot-
" ed it according to the division of the LXX. Therefore, the
" English editors of the Septuagint did not rightly consider
" the matter, when in their edition of the LXX, they di-
" vided the Psalms according to the Hebrew. For by this
" I doubt not but they have puzzled some young divines, who
" finding a text, as quoted by some ancient author from a
" particular Psalm, have looked in vain for it there, as
" numbered in either the London or Cambridge editions."
Dr. Brett, On the ancient Versions; published in Bishop Watson's Tracts, vol. iii.

Tyndal would in the same manner have perplexed his readers if he had not adhered to the old mode of quotation, as neither he nor his brother Reformers had yet circulated a new translation of the Psalms.

think sufficiently expressive of earnestness; but keeping closer to the Hebrew than Tyndal has done in another respect by preserving the active signification of לשמר. The accurate conception which Tyndal had formed of the force of מאד is, however, very creditable to him. Buxtorf merely explains it by *valdè*; but in Simon's later Lexicon, enriched with references to the Arabic, it is assigned to a root signifying, curvato corpore connisus est, incurvavit illum res aliqua, et totum occupavit. Proprie igitur nomen est substantivum, *nisum*, *intentionem virium* significans, quod vero frequentius in adverbium *intendendi* abiit: *valde*, *vehementer*, *omnino* penitus, q. d. במאד *cum intensione*, *cum nisu*, h. e. *intensiùs*, *enixius*.—J. Simonis Lex. sub rad. אד.

Should it be objected that Tyndal has here followed the LXX altogether, his intimacy with the Hebrew is still equally proved by his knowing that of three words σφοδρα, fleissig, and nimis, which do not represent the same ideas, σφοδρα was that which answered most closely to מאד; and his language decidedly proves, that,

if he had to make his selection from these three translations, his choice was not the result of a mere guess.

Tyndal was much more zealous as a divine than as a critic. His prologues or prefaces, therefore, are principally filled with summaries of the doctrines to be deduced from the Scriptures, and with impressive exhortations. Points of criticism are only mentioned once or twice incidentally; or else we should have known a great deal more of his intimacy with Hebrew. His prologue to the Gospel of St. Matthew begins as follows: "Here hast thou, "most dere reader, the New Testament, or "Covenaunt made with us of God in Christe's "bloud. Which I have looked over agayne "(now at the last) with all diligence, and "compared it with the Greke, and have "weeded out of it many fautes which lacke of "help at the beginning and oversight did sow "therein. If ought seme chaunged, or not "altogether agreyinge with the Greke, let the "finder of the faute consider the Hebrue phrase "or manner of speache left in the Greeke

" words, whose preterperfect tense and presen-
" tence is oft both one, and the future tense is
" the optative mode also, and the future tense
" oft the imperative mode in the active voyce,
" and in the passive ever. Likewise person for
" person, number for number, and interroga-
" tion for a conditional, and such like is with
" the Hebrues a common usage*." Mr. Whit-taker, after quoting this passage, has very sen-sibly remarked, "That a person who could
" thus write of St. Matthew's hebraisms
" should be compelled by *ignorance* to translate
" from the Septuagint or the Latin Vulgate"
(and I will venture to add, or from Luther),
" is perfectly incredible; and that he would
" use the latter from *choice* is inconceivable †."

But besides his prologues as he calls them, Tyndal has added, in his Pentateuch, tables expounding certain words. The very first word explained in his table for Genesis is

* The New Testament imprinted at Antwerp by Marten Emperour, MDXXXIIII. British Museum.

† Whittaker's History and Critical Enquiry, p. 46.

Abrech. This word occurs in Gen. xli. 43; where we are told that Pharaoh's officers cried before Joseph *Abrech*, which our present translation renders *Bow the knee*. Tyndal's table has "Abrech, *Tender father*, or (as some will) *Bow the knee*." Now, at any rate, this is not copied from Luther, who has translated it Der ist des landes vater. Nor did he derive his explanation from the Septuagint, which merely says Και εκηρυξεν εμπροσθεν αυτου κηρυξ. The Vulgate has "Clamante præcone, ut omnes coram eo genu flecterent;" but though this translation comes near to one of the alternatives which Tyndal has offered, he could not have learnt from it, what he has so accurately expressed, that the word must be in the imperative, if its construction is to be derived from בהך, *to bow the knee.*

The word אברך thus put into the mouth of the Egyptian heralds, may very naturally be suspected of being an Egyptian word expressed in Hebrew letters, and not translated into Hebrew. If, however, we are to consider the sacred historian as having given the meaning,

rather than merely expressed the sound of the Egyptian cry, or proclamation, these letters may be considered as forming either two Hebrew words אב רך, or the imperative hiphil of ברך; with the not very unusual substitution of the servile א for ה.* In the first case it would mean *A tender father*; in the second, *Bow the knee.*

The LXX probably considered the word as Egyptian; and omitted it as unintelligible and unimportant. The Vulgate expresses one of the supposed meanings but rather loosely. It is difficult to say on what supposition Luther founded his interpretation; unless we refer it to a mistake similar to the one noticed below †.

* Tyndal is not likely to have considered this as one of the cases where the future is used for the imperative; because, independent of the vowel points which belong to the imperative hiphil, it would be the first person if it was referred to the future active; as one of the critics noticed in Pole's Synopsis, renders it *genu flectam*, which makes nonsense of the passage.

† The Chaldee paraphrast has rendered it, זין אבוהי למלכא, This is the father *of the king*. Hence the Geneva Bible, which uses Abrech in the text, has in the margin, "Which "word some expound *Tender father*, or *Father of the king*,

Tyndal has not blindly submitted to these authorities; but has, without any parade of learning, copied the word אברך into English letters, thus tacitly marking one opinion entertained respecting the word; and has then subjoined two other explanations, the best which any Hebrew scholar could give*. That he de-

"or *Kneel down.*" The paraphrast's explanation cannot be considered as a very plausible one; but is founded on the Chaldee word רכא a king; non communiter, says Buxtorf, hoc sensu usitatum, sed certo modo et certâ locutione. Eo alludit et paraphrastes Chaldæus ibi dum vocem אברך paraphrasticè reddit, *Hic est pater regni.* Lexicon Chaldæum et Talmudicum. Buxtorf seems to have forgotten, that he had himself, under the article מלך, stated that מלכא was Chaldee for *king*, מלכו for *kingdom;* and that the paraphrast's words should therefore be rendered, hic est pater regis, not regni.

* I find in Seb. Münster, who published his translation of the Bible four years after Tyndal's Pentateuch came out, the following remark in defence of rendering *Abrech* by *genuflectite.* Kimbi, quem hic sequutus sum, putat scriptum אברך pro הברך, ut sit imperativus hiphil a verbo ברך genuflexit. In all probability Tyndal must have derived his knowledge of this word from Kimhi, or some other Rabbinical writer. The translators noticed in Pole's Synopsis, as giving this explanation of Abrech, all wrote after Tyndal; and Jerome, from whose Quæstiones sèu Traditiones Hebraicæ in Genesim I expected to find that Tyndal had drawn all the materials for his tables, has not noticed the imperative form of the word. He says, "*Et clamavit ante eum præco.* Pro "quo Aquila transtulit, *et clamavit in conspectu ejus ad-*

rived his interpretation of Abrech from the study of the Rabbinical commentators, is made still more probable by the explanation which he has given of צפנת פענח, the Egyptian title bestowed on Joseph in ver. 45 of the same forty-first chapter, for his explanation is one unknown to the LXX, the Vulgate, and Luther..

One or two specimens are sufficient to show, that, in the solution of particular difficulties, Tyndal judged for himself, without any blind deference to his predecessors. But, when I have occasion to point out the very different character of Tyndal's translation from that of Coverdale, I shall collate part of the chapter, to which these words have drawn our attention,

"*geniculationem.* Symmachus ipsum Hebraicum sermonem
"interpretans ait, *Et clamavit ante eum Abrech.* Unde
"mihi videtur non tam *præco* sive *adgeniculatio,* quæ in sa-
"lutando vel adorando Joseph accipi potest, intelligenda:
"quam id quod Hebræi tradunt, dicentes *patrem tenerum*
"ex hoc sermone transferri. אב quippe dicitur *pater,* רך *deli-*
"*catus* sive *tenerrimus;* significante scriptura, quod juxta
"prudentiam quidem *pater* omnium fuerit: sed juxta ætatem
"*tenerrimus* adolescens et puer." D. Hieronymi Opera, tom. iii. p. 223. Basle, 1553. In adopting, "Bow the "knee," King James's translators preferred a very reasonable to a very fanciful Rabbinical gloss.

with the LXX, the Vulgate, and Luther's translation. If it then appears, that in several instances, where the Hebrew idiom has been dropped by one or two of those previous translators, Tyndal has closely followed that idiom, your Lordship will surely allow, that he must have translated from the Hebrew, in the fair and reasonable meaning of that expression; for he could only know, by his acquaintance with and reference to the original, which of the previous translators kept most closely to the Hebrew, on the supposition that he worked with the Vulgate and Luther constantly before him. Indeed he would not have been the judicious person that I cannot help thinking him, had he neglected to consult any translation of good character which was within his reach; and he might reasonably have expected to derive such help from the light which Luther's genius, learning, and industry were likely to throw upon the Scriptures, that it would not have implied any discreditable consciousness of ignorance on his part, had he arranged his own order of translation, so as to be able to take advantage of Luther's previous

labours. But I do not see that any peculiar arrangement could have been necessary for that purpose. On this subject your Lordship has said, "He passed some time with Luther at "Wittenberg, and the books which Tyndal se- "lected for translation into *English* were al- "ways those which Luther had *already* trans- "lated into *German*. Now Luther did not "translate according to the order in which the "several books follow each other in the *Bible*: "he translated in an order of *his own*, and "the *same* order was observed also by Tyndal, "who translated after Luther. We may con- "clude, therefore, that *Tyndal*'s translation "was taken at least *in part* from Luther's *." Let us consider what Tyndal's order was.

In the first place, he and Luther both began with the New Testament †: but each had,

* Lect. XIV. p. 33.

† I think it unnecessary to notice Luther's translation of the seven penitential Psalms from the Latin of Reuchlin, published in 1517, about five years before his version of the New Testament. Nobody has charged Tyndal with copying Luther in this trifling task. The selection was a popular one, and an English translation of them had been printed by Pynson in 1505.

in his character of a Reformer, the same good reason for taking this portion of the Bible first. The object of each was, to induce his countrymen to throw off those abuses which the Romish clergy had engrafted on primitive Christianity; for this purpose they appealed to and laid before their countrymen the language of our Lord and his Apostles, that they might see how widely the superstructure had spread beyond its plain and simple foundations. They had no important battles to wage against the ordinarily received opinions of Christians, as to the interpretation of the Old Testament; yet they naturally would exert themselves not to leave it a sealed book, in an unknown tongue, after the perusal of the New Testament had begun to produce its desired effect, by exciting an increased veneration for the oracles of God, as compared with the foolish and frequently mischievous traditions of men. Accordingly, when they had provided their countrymen with the New Testament in their respective native languages, each began upon the Old. Luther went straight forward in the regular order of the books to the end of Solo-

mon's Song. Having advanced thus far, there seems to have been a considerable interruption of his labours as a translator. Indeed we know that he was, at this time, engaged in drawing up regulations for the churches under his superintendence, correcting or forming liturgies, and composing homilies *.

At length he published Jonah † and Habakkuk, as if he wished to show the Christian world, that he still intended to complete his version; but had not leisure for the important and considerable task of translating Isaiah; whose prophecy would have come the next in order.

We need follow him no farther, since we have already advanced higher up the catalogue than Tyndal lived to reach.

* Milner's Hist. of the Church, vol. vi. chap. 14.

† It is very probable, that, amongst the minor Prophets, he was induced to select Jonah, by the circumstance of Sebastian Münster's publishing an edition of Jonah, at Basle, in 1524, with the Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Chaldee in corresponding columns. This would have reached Wittenberg in the interval since Luther made his last previous translation from the Scriptures.

After publishing his English Pentateuch in 1530, it is said that Tyndal translated the prophet Jonah in 1531. I should imagine that this irregularity in his course of translating caught your Lordship's eye, as a proof of coincidence with Luther's order. But had he been guided by Luther's arrangement, he should have gone on regularly from the Pentateuch to Canticles before coming to Jonah. Whereas he never advanced through the many intervening books beyond Chronicles, or Nehemiah at the farthest; and what he did translate of this portion of the Scriptures was done subsequent to 1531. The truth is, that his publication of Jonah must have been a mere vehicle for a strong diatribe against the Romish Church, which fills seventeen closely printed folio columns. That this *prologe* to Jonah was not translated from any foreign writer, is evident from a single extract:—"The lives, stories, and "gifts of men, which are contained in the "Bible, they read as things no more pertaining "unto them than a tale of Robin Hood." Jonas, a solitary preacher, was ordered to call the people of a great city to repent of their sins

and to reform; and Tyndal, a persecuted individual, obliged to fly from his country, and shipwrecked* whilst preparing the means for instructing and reforming a whole nation, had inducement enough to digress for a while, with Jonah and reformation for his theme.

The comparison of Mathewe's and Coverdale's Bibles has, however, led me to suspect, that Tyndal published this declamatory thesis (which was afterwards inserted in the English Bible of 1549†), either without any translation

* "In the mean time Tyndal was busy in translating from "the Hebrew into English the five books of Moses; but "having finished his translation, and going to Hamburgh to "print it, *the vessel in which he went was shipwrecked*, and "his papers lost, so that he was forced to begin all anew, "by which means it was not printed till 1530." Lewis's Hist. of English Translations, p. 70, 3d Edition.

It is only from the connexion between the mission of Jonah, and endeavours to reform the religion of states, that I can account for the long list of separate editions of this Prophet published in the sixteenth and seventeeth centuries. In Marsh's Le Long twenty-two editions with Latin versions, or paraphrases, are enumerated, besides the vernacular translations.

† From a copy, with a manuscript title-page, in St. John's Coll. Libr. Cambridge, 4. T. 21.

The prologe to Jonah may also be seen in the Whole

of Jonah annexed to it, or with one struck off at a heat, and afterwards rejected as unfit to rank with his other translations. If Tyndal did not translate Jonah, he followed altogether, what I must take leave to call, the natural order in which any judicious Reformer would proceed. If he did translate Jonah, an accidental combination of circumstances plausibly and sufficiently accounts for this irregularity. His order would still be by no means precisely that of Luther.

But, in the second place, the relative dates of Luther's and Tyndal's versions are such, that even supposing the latter obliged to confine his labours to what had been already done by the former, that necessity would by no means have

Workes of W. Tyndal, John Frith, and Dr. Barnes. Printed by John Daye, 1573. But I have never been able to meet with any translation of Jonah by Tyndal. It is not in Archbishop Newcome's careful list of the English translations. Mathewe's Bible, which contains all Tyndal's other translations, *appears* not to contain this. From Lewis's language I should think he had never seen any thing more than the prologue. His quotation from Sir Thomas More's pamphlet of 1532 may as well refer to a commentary on Jonas as to a translation.

limited him to the adoption of Luther's order of translation. So that unless it was evident, that he had followed Luther entirely, and that in some very capricious arrangement, we should have, I think, but weak ground for assuming that some similarity in their order of proceeding was founded on the inability of the later writer to proceed without the help of his predecessor, as long as any other motive for that similarity could be suggested.

To make this clearer I will subjoin the dates of publication.

LUTHER.		TYNDAL.
New Testament	1522	
Old Test. 1st Part. The Pentateuch	1523	
2d Part. Joshua, Judges, and other historical books as far as Job	1524	
3d Part. Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles		
Jonah and Habakkuk	1526	New Testament.
Zechariah	1528	Repeated editions of the New Testament.
Isaiah		
The Wisdom of Solomon	1529	

LUTHER.		TYNDAL.
Daniel Remainder of the Apocryphal Books	1530	The Pentateuch.
A second translation of the Psalms	1531	Jonah.
Remainder of the Prophets	1532	
The Bible complete	1534	Repeated editions of N. T. and Pentateuch.
	1537	Joshua and historical books to Chronicles, inclusive, published after his death *.

Now, if any person felt inclined to suppose that Tyndal, had he been obliged to look out for assistance from Luther's translations, would have begun with Genesis instead of the New Testament, he may see at once from this table, that even if Tyndal had been unable to do more than copy Luther word for word, this would not have made it at all necessary for him to take up Luther's New Testament rather than

* I have extracted the dates of Luther's translations from the Bibliotheca Theologica of Walchius, tom. iv. p. 82. They may be seen, also, in Le Long, Bibliotheca Sacra, cap. iv. Pars II. Art. xiv. § 3. For these references I was indebted to the note on Michaelis, p. 620, vol. ii. ed. 2d.

The dates of Tyndal's translations are from Lewis's and Archbishop Newcome's list of English versions.

his Genesis, in order to bring out a translation of some portion of Scripture in 1526: still less will he imagine, that Tyndal's selection of Jonah for publication in 1531, was influenced by Luther's having translated that Prophet earlier than Isaiah, which yet came out in 1528; especially as Tyndal had not yet followed Luther in translating Joshua, &c.

In fact, the long intervals which appear between Tyndal's publication of those portions of Scripture which he did translate, seem much more suited to a man slowly working his way through the Hebrew text, and consulting Rabbinical glosses * as he proceeded, than to a person living in Germany, there translating from the language of persons with whom he conversed, and assisted by reference to the Latin.

I cannot, therefore, perceive that your Lordship's premises, as far as they are drawn from the order of Tyndal's translation, afford ground

* See Appendix, Art. A.

firm enough for building any conclusion on them whatever;

But you add, that your "conclusion is further confirmed by the *Germanisms* which it "contains, *some* of which are still preserved "in our *authorized* Version*."

Now, your Lordship is so well known to be thoroughly master of the German language, that were you to point out any expression in our English Bible, as a Germanism, I should not feel the least doubt but that the peculiar turn of its arrangement corresponded exactly with the German idiom; and yet it seems that even a native of Germany might be mistaken in supposing any particular form of expression, used in Luther's Bible, to be a genuine instance of German idiom; for Wolder, speaking on this very subject, has said, "Saxonismos certè ego infinitos non nisi Hebraismos "esse comperi†." I should suppose that it

* Lect. XIV. p. 33.

† Biblia Sacra, Græce, Latine, et Germanice, operâ Davidis Wolderi, Hamburgh, 1596, Præfatio ad Lectorem.

The

must require an intimate knowledge of the German language, as it existed before Luther's time, as well as of its present state, to be able to separate the idiomatic expressions of genuine German origin from those idioms, which, being originally Hebrew, have been introduced into the German language, and rendered popular by the use of Luther's version. Yet the latter would find their place as naturally in an English Bible translated from the Hebrew, as in one translated from Luther; indeed their frequency would be just in proportion to the fidelity of these translations to their common original.

But even supposing that sort of anomalous construction, which properly constitutes an idiomatic expression, to be observed in corresponding passages of the English and Luther's Bible, and to be, in each, an adequate repre-

The Latin of Wolder's Bible is Pagninus's translation; but he has himself added, in the margin, corrections, bringing the Latin still closer to the Hebrew idiom. It seems quite impossible to represent in one language the idiom of a very different tongue with more closeness than Wolder has done. He has, also, given Luther's German in a parallel column, so that a more competent witness to the point for which I have quoted him could not well be imagined.

sentative, but not a close copy of the Hebrew phrase; these similar idioms in English and German might be equally genuine in each language. It would frequently be very rash to assert that they were not so. When we consider the original affinity between the German language and our own, we shall feel, that a person ought to have devoted very great attention to our early English literature, to be able to say of any expression, found in an old writer, that it is a Germanism. The recollection of a single passage, from some old chronicler, might enable any one to vindicate the English origin of a suspected Germanism in our Bible; whilst habits of very extensive black-letter reading might leave a critic in doubt as to the propriety of positively asserting, that it could not be of English origin. It would sometimes require all Mr. Sharon Turner's knowledge of Saxon and of the mixed language which succeeded it, added to Mr. Todd's familiarity with the style in use from Chaucer to Milton; to qualify a person to decide with certainty, that an idiom resembling the German and used by some Elizabethan writer, must

have been a recent importation from Germany, and could not have grown up with the growth of our English tongue.

Such, my Lord, were my reflections, whilst I imagined that you had in your view certain expressions in our authorized Version, which you considered as Germanisms. But when I, afterwards, read your translation of Michaelis, I found that he said, "The translation of Lu-
"ther has had material influence on those,
"which were made by his followers in the Re-
"formation; not excepting even the English,
"where examples might be produced of Ger-
"manisms, that to every Englishman must
"appear obscure *." Now, he has given no example of these Germanisms; and I cannot consider the authority of a foreigner as of the least weight in this question; because, though he might perceive the similarity, or, if you please, the identity of an idiom in our Bible with the German, he could not be at all competent to assert of any such idiom, that it then appeared

* Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. ii. chap. vii. § 21.

in the English language for the first time. As a commentator on Michaelis you have, in your note on this passage *, partly anticipated my objection. But you have left it unanswered, and contented yourself with observing, that Michaelis's assertion was not likely to be wrong, because Rogers certainly, and Tyndal probably, made use of Luther's version. As you have perceived the difficulty that might be started, and have chosen rather to argue for the probable truth of what Michaelis has said, than to give satisfactory specimens of these Germanisms, I cannot help thinking myself entitled to conclude, that the proof of their existence in our Bible rests, after all, solely on Michaelis's authority; for your Lordship would not choose to ground an argument *for* their existence on the probability that Tyndal used Luther's translation, whilst you are endeavouring to prove, *from* their existence, that Tyndal did use that translation.

At the same time that I venture to argue thus, allow me to add, that either I am wrong,

* See Appendix, Art. B.

and there are some phrases in the Bible which you have been in the habit of considering as Germanisms; or it certainly did not occur to you how little weight would attach to a foreigner's opinion, as to the genuineness of idiomatic expressions in the English Bible. For, though such a course of Lectures as yours, comprehends the result of too much reading to allow of giving references in proof of every assertion, yet I am sure your Lordship would have been quite incapable of allowing your hearers to consider the existence of these Germanisms as verified by your observation, whilst it really depended upon the assertion of a very incompetent witness; had you thought the distinction between your own authority and his, so material towards gaining the assent of your audience to the conclusion which you were proceeding to establish.

Having said thus much on the presumptive evidence offered against the independence of Tyndal's translation, I shall now proceed to give some account of Coverdale's Bible, preparatory to that collation of his and Tyndal's ver-

sion with the Hebrew, which I proposed, as affording direct proof that the latter made his translation immediately from the original.

After Tyndal had published his English Pentateuch, in 1530, he continued, in Antwerp, labouring at his work of translation; being assisted by Coverdale and by Rogers, who was chaplain there to the merchants adventurers *; but, in 1534, he was seized as a heretic, and carried off to the castle of Vilvorde. His papers seem to have remained in the hands of his friends; at least so much of them as contained translations of the Old Testament from Joshua to Chronicles inclusive, with prefaces to several different books of the Scriptures. He was detained a prisoner for about a year and a half, before the atrocity of his persecutors was completed, by bringing him to the stake.

* From what will afterwards appear with respect to the attainments of Coverdale, I should imagine, that whilst Tyndal translated from the Hebrew, and consulted the works of the Rabbis, Coverdale and Rogers collated for him the Latin and other recent versions. Rogers was so well skilled in German, that he was held qualified to take the charge of a congregation in Saxony.

During this interval, exertions were made by the English merchants, and by the Lord Cromwell, to procure his liberty. He was in the hands of the Emperor's officers; and the policy of that sovereign sometimes prevented him from proceeding to those extreme severities, to which his haughty impatience of any opposition to the Imperial decrees naturally inclined him; so that Coverdale and Tyndal's other friends were not without hopes, that the time might yet come when he would be able to complete that important work in which he had now so far advanced.

What Tyndal had already done had been received with great avidity in England; and had increased the appetite of still greater numbers, for more of those Scriptures which had so long been kept out of their reach. This feeling was so strongly excited and so evident, that the Dutch booksellers and a person named Joye had taken advantage of it, and endeavoured to supply the market with surreptitious and ill-corrected editions of Tyndal's transla-

tions; whilst he was slowly proceeding with his labours. In order, therefore, that the people might be fed with instruction, before their zeal was chilled by any long delay, Coverdale immediately prepared a translation from such materials as were most accessible to him *.

* In the prologe prefixed to his translation, he gives the following account of his view in making it, and of the sources from which he drew.

" Myles Coverdale unto the Chrysten reader."

" Considering how excellent knowledge and lernynge an " interpreter of Scripture ought to have in the tongues, and " pondering also mine own insufficiency therein, and how " weak I am to perform the office of a translatour, I was the " more lothe to meddle with this worke. Notwithstanding " when I considerd how great pity it was that we should " want it so long, and called to my remembrance *the adver-* " *sity of them which were not only of rype knowledge, but* " *wolde also with all their hertes have performed that they* " *began, if they had not had impediment, considering I say* " *that by reason of their adversity it could not so soon have* " *been brought to an end*, as our most prosperous nation would " fayne have had it, these and other reasonable causes con- " sidered, I was the more bolde to take it in hand. And *to* " *helpe me herein I have had sondrye translacyons, not only in* " *Latyn but also of the Douche interpreters, whom* (because " of their singular gyftes and speciall diligence in the Bible) " *I have been the more glad to follow for the most part*, ac- " cording as I was requyred."

We have already * elsewhere seen him declaring, that he was as ready to serve the cause of religion "in one translation as in another;" and the one which he now presented to his countrymen was avowedly made from the Latin and German †.

The time must have been too short, I should imagine, for translating the whole Bible from any sources; since Tyndal, who suffered in 1536, was certainly at large in 1533; and Coverdale's Bible, though not published till 1536, bears the date of 1535 ‡. It is most pro-

* Page 32.

† The title of Coverdale's Bible is:

The Bible, that is the Holy Scripture of the Olde and Newe Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe. MDXXXV.

From a copy in the British Museum. 10 N N e.

A letter to the King follows; in which he says, "I faithfully translated this out of five sundry interpreters."

‡ The interval between the date on the title-page and the actual publication is clearly marked by a curious alteration in the dedicatory letter to Henry VIII. which contains these words, "your dearest just wife, and most vertuous pryncesse Qu. JAne." This is not as it was printed; for Anne has been altered into JAne by the pen. The epithet *just* proved the party of the dedicator, who held the marriage with Anne

bable, therefore, that Coverdale had begun this translation before he became connected with Tyndal; that he desisted from completing or from publishing it, when he found that Tyndal, whose superior skill "in the tongues" he decidedly acknowledges, was employed in preparing a translation; and that he resumed the office of translator, as soon as he saw that the interruption to Tyndal's labours was not likely to terminate speedily. That he did not rather content himself with beginning his own translation from the point where Tyndal left off, may easily be accounted for; because, however indifferent he himself might be to the reputation of authorship, the irritability which Tyndal had evinced on the occasion of Joye's interference with his translations, must have made Coverdale aware that his imprisoned and persecuted friend would feel impatient at having the productions of a less skilful hand engrafted on his own *. As soon, however, as Tyndal's

Boleyne to be legal, notwithstanding the Pope's refusal to declare the former marriage null; when applied to Jane Seymour this word lost its force.

* I have already mentioned the grounds which Coverdale might have for hoping that Tyndal would yet live to re-

death removed all hopes of seeing him finish his work, and all fears of breaking in upon "the last infirmity of a noble mind," Coverdale, with a most exemplary rejection of all personal vanity, undertook the publication of Mathewe's Bible; from which he has thrown out every particle of his own translation, that could be replaced by Tyndal's.

Coverdale's Bible then is confessedly a secondary version; and is entirely unconnected with Tyndal's translations.

Let us proceed to ascertain how far this assertion is confirmed by the result of an actual comparison. I will take for this purpose the first ten verses of Gen. xli. a chapter to which my attention has been already drawn by the word *Abrech*. By bringing under your Lordsume his task. In the prologe lately quoted he alludes to the possibility of this:—"Though it be not worthily ministered "unto thee in this translation, (by reason of my rudeness), "*yet if thou be fervent in thy prayer, God shall not only send "it thee in a better shape, by the ministration of other that "began it afore,* but shall also move the hertes of them "which as yet medled not withal, to take it in hand."

ship's view at the same time our authorized Version, I hope farther to show, that King James's translators did not sacrifice any opportunities of copying the Hebrew more closely, to the rules which required them to employ the language of their predecessors wherever they could. I shall also subjoin Diodati's version, which our authorized translators have never been accused of copying; yet, they probably consulted *, and will be found to agree with it, perhaps, more often than with any other. This may serve to show how little proof of the dependence of one translator upon another can properly be deduced from coincidences of expression; where they are also coincidences in correct rendering. Following the Hebrew so wonderfully closely as King James's translators have done, they are naturally found nearest in language to that translator who is nearest to the original.

Gen. xli. ויהי, literally; "And it was." An introductory expression at the beginning of a

* See quotation from Selden, page 22.

narrative; fairly represented by the Greek Εγενετο δε.

Tyndal. And it fortuned.

Diodati. Ed avvenne.

Auth. V. And it came to pass.

Omitted by Luther, Coverdale, and the Vulgate.

והנה. Lit. And behold.

LXX. Ωετο.

Vulg. Putabat.

Tyndal. And thought.

Luther. Wie.

Cov. How that.

Diod. E gli pareva.

Auth. V. And behold.

על־היאר. The Greek idiom corresponds exactly with the Hebrew.

LXX. Επι τω ποταμω.

Vulg. Super fluvium.

Tynd. By a river's side.

Luth. Am wasser.

Cov. By a water side.

Diod. Presso al fiume.

Auth. V. By the river.

Tyndal loses the force of the emphatic article which pointed to the Nile. The Latin could not well express it. Coverdale, as in the preceding instance, copied Luther's vague expression. The authorized Version exactly corresponds to Diodati's, and could not be improved.

Verse 2d begins with "And behold."

LXX. Και ιδου.

Vulg. Omits it, and alters the construction.

Tynd. And that.

Luth. Und sähe.

Cov. And behold.

Diod. Ed ecco.

Auth. V. And behold.

מן־היאר עלת. Lit. Out of the river ascending.

LXX. Εκ του ποταμου ανεβαινον.

Vulg. De quo ascendebant.

Tynd. There came out of the river.

Luth. Aus dem wasser steigen.

Cov. Out of the water there came.

Diod. Dal fiume salivano.

Auth. V. There came up out of the river.

Tyndal lost nothing but the expression of ascent; and the Auth. V. has restored it.

ובריאת בשר. Tyndal, Coverdale, and the authorized Version have here preserved the Hebrew exactly—and fat-fleshed.

Diod. E carnose.

LXX. Και ,εκλεκ]αι ταις σαρξι.

Vulg. Et crassæ nimis.

Luther combines it with the preceding epithet schöne fette.

Unimportant as the expression is, we have here a decided instance, in which both Tyndal and Coverdale have come closer to the Hebrew than their supposed guides.

Ver. 3.

ותעמדנה. Lit. And stood.

LXX. Και ,ενεμον]ο.

Vulg. Et pascebantur.

Tynd. And stode.

Luth. Und traten.

Cov. And went.

Diod. E si fermarono.

Auth. V. And stood.

Here Tyndal selected the correct word, where his predecessors had wandered considerably.

Ver. 4. Here the epithets are a little varied; the word *flesh* comes after *lean* in the Hebrew; but not after *fat*.

The Latin is very vague; Quorum mira species, et habitudo corporum.

Luther is not close.

Tyndal has followed the LXX in marking the variation of the epithets; but his well-chosen words, The evyll favoured and leane fleshed—wel favoured and fatte—are much closer imitations of רעות המראה—ודקת הבשר—&c. than either the Greek, Latin, or German.

Diod. observes the variation, but breaks up lean-fleshed into two epithets, e magre, e scarne.

The authorized Version follows Tyndal, only changing *evyll* into *ill*.

Ver. 5. I will only remark here, that whilst all the other translations have deviated slightly, at the beginning of this verse, from the Hebrew, by using some distinct expression of repetition with *slept*, as well as with *dreamt*, King James's translators have corrected even this trifling inaccuracy, and keeping close to the Hebrew, say, *And he slept and dreamed the second time.*

Ver. 6. שדופת קדים

Lit. Turned black by the East wind.

LXX. Ανεμιοφθοροι.

Vulg. Percussæ uredine.

Luth. Versengete.

Cov. And blasted.

Tynd. Blasted with the wind.

Diod. Arse dal vento orientale.

Auth. V. Blasted with the East wind.

Münster has Orientali vento percussæ; and Pagninus caught the full force of קדים. Tyndal is at least as correct as the LXX, and more so than Luther and the Vulgate.

Ver. 7. והנה חלם

Lit. : And behold a dream.

LXX. Και ην ενὑπνιον.

Vulg. Post quietem.

Tynd. And see, here is his dream.

Luth. Und merckte dass es ein traum war.

Cov. And saw that it was a dream.

Diod. is precise: Ed ecco un sogno.

Auth. V. And behold *it was* a dream.

The Vulgate is a mere paraphrase. Tyndal is quite independent, and comes closer to the original than any of the translators, from whom he has been supposed to be obliged to borrow his knowledge.

Ver. 8. Of this verse I will only remark, that though the word חלמו *his dream*, is in the singular, it is followed by אותם *them* in the plural. This peculiarity is copied by Luther and King James's translators, but all the others have overlooked it; or thought proper to correct it. This does not prove the exactness of either Tyndal or Coverdale as translators. But it is another instance, that they were neither of

them afraid of quitting Luther. The Greek has *το ενυπνιον* and *αυτο*. The Vulgate; Nec erat qui interpretaretur; a neutral expression in this case.

Ver. 10. Begins in the Hebrew exactly as in our authorized Version. "Pharaoh was "wroth."

LXX. *Φαραω ωργισθη.*

Vulg. Iratus rex.

Luth. Da Pharao zornig ward.

Cov. Whan Pharao was angrie.

Diod. Faraone si cruccià.

Tyndal begins abruptly like the original, Pharao was angrie. Where the ideas expressed are so much the same, how could he know which mode of translation was closest to the original but by referring to the original? The slightest distinction will often show most decidedly that the translation has been made immediately from the Hebrew.

שר המבחים

LXX. *Αρχιμαγειρος.*

Vulg. Princeps militum.

Luth. Hofmeister.

Tynd. and Coverdale; Chefe marshall.

Diod. Capitan delle guardie.

Auth. V. Captain of the guard.

Tyndal has specified his reasons under the article *Marshall*, in his "Table expounding "certain Wordes in the first Booke of Moses."

"Marshall. In Hebrue he is called Sarta-"baim, as thou wouldest say, Lord of the "Slaughtermen. And though that Tabaim "be taken for *cookes* in many places, (for the "cookes did slay the beastes themselves in those "days), yet it may be taken for them that put "men to execution also; and that I thought "it should here best signify, inasmuch as he "had the oversight of the kynge's prison, and "the kynge's prisoners, were they never so "greate men, were under his custodie; and, "therefore, I call him Chief Marshall, an of-"ficer as it were the Lieutenant of the Tower "or Maister of the Marshalsey *."

* The existence of this article in Tyndal's table sufficiently accounts for Coverdale's agreeing with him here; for though he did not choose to form his translation on Tyndal's, sentence by sentence; but to give what he had already pre-

This specimen of criticism on the correct meaning of a Hebrew word not bearing, as he observes, its usual signification here, might be reasonably accepted as sufficiently proving his intimacy with the Hebrew language. It shows an extent of knowledge beyond the information actually conveyed by it; for he says, Tabaim is used for *cooks* in many places, *because* the cooks killed the animals which they afterwards dressed. Why should he consider this as a reason for calling *cooks* Tabaim? He felt that in stating this he had a sufficient reason, and he was aware that some reason might fairly be required, *because* he knew, though he has not formally expressed it, that the root טבח means *to slay*, and never *to cook*.

If, instead of examining the accuracy with which an ordinary passage has been rendered pared, or at any rate something so distinct that it could not be considered by Tyndal as a piracy of his work; yet Coverdale might be expected to acquiesce in his friend's criticisms on particular words where given at length; and to form or alter his own translation accordingly.

by these different translators, we refer to more disputable texts, we may chance to find Coverdale misled by Luther, but shall always observe Tyndal judging for himself; and generally forming a correct decision.

For example, in Exodus, xi. 3. it may be doubted whether the ו in ויתן is conversive or not. If it is, the word יתן will of course have a preterite; and if not, its future signification which naturally belongs to it. The whole verse has so much the tone of a parenthesis, that the majority of translators have preferred considering the Vau as conversive; yet there is reasonable ground for differing. Ex. xi. 3. ויתן יהוה is accordingly rendered by

The LXX. Κυριος δε εδωκε.

Pagninus. Et dedit Dominus.

Tyndal. And the Lord gatt.

Diodati. E'l Signore rendette.

Auth. V. And the Lord gave.

Vulg. Dabit autem Dominus.

Münster. Dabitque Dominus.

Luther. Denn der herr wird geben.

Cov. For the Lord shall give.

Again in Ex. xiv. 25., וַיְנַהֲגֵהוּ בְּכִבְדֻת are words whose import may admit of much difference of opinion.

LXX. Και ηγαγεν αυτους μετα βιας.

Vulg. Ferebanturque in profundum.

Münster. Atque violenter duxit eum.

Luther. Sturzete sie mit ungestüm *.

Cov. And overthrew them with a storm.

Tynd. And cast them down to the ground.

Diod. Gli conduceva pesantemente.

Auth. V. That they drave them heavily.

Margin. And made them to go heavily.

Of the intermediate English Bibles.

Mathewe's Bible has, as usual, the words of Tyndal.

Cranmer's. And carried them away violently.

* Ungestümm. adv. impétueusement, avec véhémence. Of the corresponding adjective it is observed, Il se dit du temps, des vents, de la mer.—(Dict. des deux Nations.) This idea of the meaning seems to have suggested to Coverdale his expression, *with a storm.*

The Geneva: And they drave them *with much ado.*

Margin. *Heavily.*

The Bishops' Bible; as is frequently the case, restores Cranmer's words.

Olivetan's French Bible has, Et les renversa impétueusement *.

Exod. xv. 1. סום ורכבו As far as appears from the punctuation it could not be decided, with certainty, whether וְרֹכְבוֹ belongs to רֶכֶב a chariot, or רַכָּב a rider. The affix ו *his*, however, leaves no doubt, but that it should be rendered *his rider*. Accordingly, I do not find that any translator thought otherwise, till Luther rendered these words, Ross und wagen. Coverdale, misled by him, has, *Horse and charet*; which mistake is not made by Tyndal, and has not been followed in any other English Bible.

I will notice but one passage more; it involves considerable difficulty; and Tyndal has

* Fol. Edition, 1535. I notice this because it has been said, that the English Geneva Bible was translated verbatim from Olivetan's French one.

made so bold, and apparently unprecedented a conjecture in a very ingenious solution of it, that none of his successors have ventured on its adoption. The question is, whether the word קשת has or has not its ordinary and only known meaning of *a bow* in II. Samuel, i. 18.

ויאמר ללמד בני־יהודה קשת

In our present version these words and the context stand as follows.

V. 17. And David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and Jonathan his son:

V. 18. (Also he bade them teach the children of Judah *the use of* the bow: behold *it is* written in the Book of Jasher *.)

V. 19. The beauty of Israel is slain upon thy high places: how are the mighty fallen.

Translated in this manner, a very awkward and strange parenthetical remark of the historian is thrown in between the announcement of

* In the margin, *The upright.* It is a doubt, whether this word is to be considered as a proper name, or ought to be translated: this doubt is not connected with any difficulty in the passage.

David's lamentation, and the words of the lamentation itself. In the LXX it stands thus:

Και εθρηνησε Δαυιδ τον θρηνον τουτον επι Σαυλ και επι Ιωναθαν τον υιον αυτου. Και ειπε τους διδαξαι τους υιους Ιουδα (Var. Lect. τοξον). Ιδου γεγραπται. κ. τ. λ.

Vulgate. Planxit autem David planctum hujusve modi super Saul, et super Jonathan filium ejus. (Et præcepit ut docerent filios Juda *arcum*, sicut scriptum est in Libro justorum.) Et ait *, &c.

'Luther. Und befahl, man solte die kinder Juda den bogen lehren.

Coverdale. And David mourned this lamentation over Saul and Jonathan his son, and commanded to teach the children of Judah the bowe, &c.

But in Mathewes's Bible, in which this portion of Tyndal's labours, as a translator, first appeared, we have, "And David sang this song "of mourning over Saul and over Jonathan "his son, and bade to teach the children of "Israel the staves thereof; and behold it is "written in the book of the righteous."

* Old copies of the Vulgate are said, however, to have planctum instead of arcum.

By translating קשת "the staves thereof," Tyndal has given clearness and consistency to the passage. I cannot find that any previous, or any succeeding translator*, has ventured to render it thus. John Gregorie, M.A. of Oxford, a learned orientalist, who published notes and observations upon some difficulties in Scripture†, refers to Tyndal's as the best translation of this passage, and apparently means to defend it by arguments calculated to prove, that *the bow* was ,the title of this elegiac psalm‡. But had

* It was altered in Cranmer's (the next) Bible to, "The "use of the bowe," where, as in our authorized Version, the words, *the use of*, are supplied to fill out the supposed meaning.

† Mr. Todd has noticed a fourth edition of this tract, published 1684. The copy in the British Museum is of an earlier date.

‡ This opinion has since been adopted by several commentators. In Pole's Synopsis, the following are the best arguments given for its adoption. Arcus hîc est titulus sequentis cantilenæ.

1. Quia de hoc arcu dicitur, Ecce scriptus est.

2. LXX. Dicunt David edidisse threnum hunc; nec ullum aliud nomen habent quod arcui respondet.

4. Sic aliqui Davidis psalmi a titulo dicti sunt, ut Psal. xxi. A cerva matutina. Psal. xliv. A liliis.

The second argument however fails if we accept the various reading.

Tyndal thought so, he would probably have rendered קשת *this psalm*, or *this song*. His version, *the staves thereof*, seems to me only defensible on the ground, that from קשש collegit, a word might have been formed, agreeably with the analogy of many other Hebrew derivatives, which should signify something like the Latin word fasciculus; in which case, though the punctuation is rather against the supposition, קשת would be *fasciculos*, the *staves*, or separate divisions of the song. Now, whether Tyndal was right or mistaken, in thinking that קשת might properly be here assumed to have been formed in some such manner, and consequently not to be identical with the word which is properly *a bow*, he is generally a cautious translator, and must, therefore, have felt himself very much at home in Hebrew to have proceeded on such a conjecture.

If any person still feels inclined to suspect, that there must, after all, be some very strong authority for Tyndal's ignorance of Hebrew, to have induced one writer of reputation after an-

other to speak of him as unable to translate from the original, whilst such clear evidence to the contrary might be had from inspecting his translations, I can only say, that I have not been able to discover any such authority. Mr. Whittaker traces the opinion to Fuller, who has said of Tyndal, "I *presume* he trans-"lated from the Latin." Now Fuller is well known to have been a much more fanciful than accurate writer; and Mr. W. has justly re-marked on this expression, that "the very "manner in which it is said, shows that the "historian had no authority for the fact*." Yet Fuller's conjecture seems to me to have been the only ground for Johnson's saying, "Probably Tyndal rendered the Old Testa-"ment out of the Latin, having little or no "skill in the Hebrew†." After him follows Dr. Macknight, who, with a most improper exaggeration of the last quoted words, says, "These translations, *according to Johnson*, he "made not from the Hebrew, but from the

* Whittaker's Hist. and Crit. Inquiry, p. 47.

† Bishop Watson's Tracts, vol. iii. p. 70.

" Vulgate Latin, or, as the Popish writers af-
" firm, from Luther's German translation*."
Foxe, the martyrologist, who saw in Tyndal
" the faithful servant of Christ and his con-
" stant martyr," has rather hinted at, than described, his great learning and " knowledge of
" tongues." But to the surmises of Fuller and Johnson I beg leave to oppose the direct evidence, which a foreigner has accidentally supplied, with regard to the extent of Tyndal's attainments. It is taken from the journal of a person whose name is familiar to your Lordship, as that of a very judicious man, who took a deep interest in all questions connected with the great contest against the Church of Rome.

" Dixit nobis, Buschius, Wormatiæ sex
" mille exemplaria Novi Testamenti Anglicè
" excusa. Id operis versum esse ab Anglo,
" illic cum duobus Britannis divertente, ita
" septem linguarum perito, Hebraicæ, Græcæ,
" Latinæ, Italicæ, Hispanicæ, Britannicæ,

* Macknight, General Preface to Translation of Epistles, sect. 2.

" Gallicæ, ut, quamcunque loquatur, in eâ " natum putes *."

Mr. Whittaker thought that Coverdale, as well as Tyndal, translated from the Hebrew. He had not seen, as he acknowledges, Coverdale's title-page, in which it is expressly declared, that his Bible is translated from the Dutch and Latin. But independent of Coverdale's declaration, your Lordship cannot have failed to observe, in the collation made above, evident marks of his translating from Luther; yet not without occasionally preferring other authorities. Of four passages which Mr. Whittaker has quoted, to show that Coverdale could venture to differ both from the Septuagint and Vulgate, two are instances in which he has copied Luther, a third is from Dan. iii. 25.

* Schellhornii Amœnitates literariæ, tom. iv. p. 431. Excerpta quædam e Diario Geor. Spalatini. The immediately preceding date is in August 1526, at the beginning of which year Tyndal seems to have been driven by Cochlæus from Cologne to Worms (see Art. B. in Appendix), and at the close of it his New Testament was published. Cochlæus's account of the number which the English translators had wished to print at Cologne, tallies with what Buschius mentioned as printed at Worms.

ורוה די רביעיא דמה לבר־אלהין

LXX. Και ἡ ορασις του Τεταρτου ὁμοια υἱῷ θεοῦ.

Vulgate. Et species quarti similis filio Dei.

Luther. Und der vierte ist gleich, als wäre er ein sohn der götter.

Coverdale. And the fourth was like an angel to look upon.

This mistranslation of Coverdale's is so extraordinary, that, unless it be considered as a mere oversight, it would go far to prove, that he could not read the Chaldee. I am certainly inclined to think that he examined the passage as a person who could not refer to the original, and that observing in ver. 28. these words of Nebuchadnezzar, "Blessed be God who has "sent his *angel* and delivered his servants," he thought the texts ought to be made consistent, by using the word *angel* in both. But in the Chaldee, as in our authorized Version, the words are different; in ver. 25 it is בר־אלהין and in ver. 28, מלאכה

The fourth instance is one in which Mr. Whittaker considers Coverdale's translation as

better than the LXX, Vulgate, Luther's, or our own authorized Version. It is from Isaiah, lvii. 5.

הנחמם באלים תחת כל־עץ רענן

Οι παρακαλοῦντες* ειδωλα ὑπο δενδρα δασεα.

Vulgate. Qui consolamini in dlis subter omne lignum frondosum.

Luther. Die ihr in der brunst zu den götzen lauffet, unter alle graüne baüme.

Authorized Version. Inflaming yourselves with idols under every green tree.

Pagninus. Incalescentes cum diis sub omni ligno viridi.

Münster. Calefacitis vos apud quercus sub omni ligno frondoso, et immolatis pueros in convallibus subter prominentes petras.

Coverdale. Ye take your pleasure under the okes and under all grene trees, *the childe being slaine* in the vallies and dennes of stones.

Diodati. Voi, che vi riscaldate dietro alle querce, sott' ogni albero verdeggiante.

* Var. Lect. επι.

The question is, whether אלים is to be considered as the plural of אל, fortis, Deus, for which it would ordinarily be taken; or as an irregular plural for the name of an oak, derived, if such, from איל, and spelt in a preceding passage of this same prophet, i. 29, אילים

I have given Coverdale's translation of the whole verse, because the expression, "the child "being slaine," seems to me to show, that he was translating here from some Latin version, as the idiom is, evidently, that of a Latin ablative absolute*. Now, Mr. Whittaker believes, that Coverdale's Bible was printed at Zurich; and at Zurich a Latin translation of Isaiah, by Zuinglius, had been published in 1529. Œcolampadius, too, had published a Latin version of Isaiah in the neighbourhood (at Basle) in 1525†; and though I have not been able to meet with either of these translations, it cannot be unreasonable to conjecture, that

* A similar instance of Coverdale's harsh way of rendering this Latin idiom, may be seen in the Appendix, Art. B. C

† Le Long, ed. Masch. vol. ii. p. 553.

the source of Coverdale's version of this passage might be found in them, particularly as the Latin Zurich Bible of 1543, formed by the disciples of these men, contains the elements of two peculiar turns of expression in Coverdale's text, rendering the verse as follows:—Incalescitis *apud quercus sub omni ligno frondoso,* jugulantes liberos in vallibus, subtus *in cavernis petrarum.* I need not tell your Lordship, that Coverdale had notoriously a greater respect for the opinions of the Helvetic divines, than for those of Luther*. The pre-

* It appears too, that the clergy of Zurich published a vernacular translation of the Prophets from the Hebrew in 1529; and that they had been accustomed to read lectures on them. *Le Long, Par. ed.* 1723, *vol. i. p.* 399. So that, if Coverdale was at Zurich about that time, he might have had his attention directed to this explanation of a difficult text.

If the above conjecture be thought groundless, Coverdale might still have borrowed his view of the meaning of אלים from Münster. Mr. Whittaker indeed has remarked, that the second part of Münster's Bible, which contains Isaiah, did not come out till 1535. But Münster, who published a polyglot Jonah in 1524, afterwards gave the world an edition of Isaiah in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. *Le Long, ed. Masch. vol. i. p.* 398. The date is uncertain, but it most likely was formed, like his Jonah, as part of a preparation for going through the task of making a complete version, and therefore earlier than that version.

sumption, therefore, that Coverdale might and did form his translation of this text from one of the five Dutch or Latin interpreters, whom he has spoken of as his guides, is surely too strong to allow its supposed peculiarity to be accepted as a proof that he translated from the Hebrew.

But as I cannot allow that Coverdale's Bible deserves the credit of being a primary translation, so neither can I concede to Mr. Whittaker, that it is entitled to be regarded as the joint production of Coverdale and Tyndal. The latter would never have allowed any translator, whose work passed under his correction, to wander from the Hebrew to the idiom of intermediate translations, in the way in which we have seen Coverdale doing. Your Lordship may, also, recollect the observation which I quoted from Tyndal on the force of the word מאד in Ps. cxix. ver. 4. With such an opinion of that text, he would never have sanctioned Coverdale's rendering it, "Thou hast geven "strayte charge to kepe thy commandments." And Coverdale has expressed his conviction of Tyndal's superior knowledge so candidly and

decidedly *, that he was not likely to have resisted Tyndal's correct notion of this verse. We have, besides, seen † Coverdale mentioning Tyndal's adversity, as that which made him determine to take his translation in hand; which either implies, that he did not begin it till Tyndal's imprisonment, or, as I have stated to be more probable, that he then resumed a task which had lain neglected from the time that he found an abler scholar devoting all his powers to the gradual production of a complete English Bible.

Coverdale's Bible, then, was altogether a secondary translation, yet neither built entirely on the Vulgate nor on Luther's version, nor yet solely compiled from them both; but formed upon as careful a comparison as he could institute of the probable accuracy of different previous translators, in rendering each particular phrase or text. But I expect to find no difficulty in convincing your Lordship, that the English Bible was most thoroughly purged of

* Preface to Coverdale's Bible, already quoted.

† See note, p. 74.

such unnecessary deviations from the Hebrew idiom, as this secondary translation might have been thought likely to have transmitted into the subsequent versions.

And, first, Coverdale himself in 1537, within two years after publishing his own, edited what is called Mathewe's Bible. In this he entirely rejected as much of his own version as could be replaced from Tyndal's published or unpublished translations. The chroniclers of those times, and subsequent writers, have been very inaccurate in their statements of Tyndal's share. But the test, which ascertains how much of the Bible of 1537 should be assigned to Tyndal, is a comparison of Coverdale's and Mathewe's Bibles. Now the text of the latter is altogether different from that of the former in the Pentateuch, but agrees with Tyndal's published version of that part of Scripture: it continues to differ from Coverdale through Joshua, &c. to the end of Chronicles; it then becomes a mere copy of Coverdale's Bible, with a few corrections, and continues so to the end of Apocrypha. After this, it again becomes a

transcript of Tyndal's version, as contained in his last published edition of the New Testament.

So that, whilst the Old Testament of Mathewe's Bible is Tyndal's to the end of the second Book of Chronicles, the New Testament is his entirely; and the only part, of Coverdale's translation, incorporated in Mathewe's Bible, is from Ezra to the end of the Apocrypha, both inclusive *.

I am sorry to observe that your Lordship has thought fit to sanction much of Johnson's

* It has been a common opinion, that the Nehemiah and Jonah of Mathewe's Bible were of Tyndal's translation. But on applying our test, we shall be convinced that they were not so. For they are verbatim the same in Coverdale's and in Mathewe's Bible; and there is no likelihood that Coverdale should have inserted Tyndal's translation of these two portions of Scripture alone in the Bible of 1535, without some notice, at least, of his reasons for this exception.

In the prophet Jonah too, it is observable that קיקיון is rendered in Mathewe's Bible *wild vine*; a translation which is not likely to have proceeded from so good an Hebraist as Tyndal. Luther has translated it kürbis. It is now, generally, supposed from what Jerome has said, and on some other grounds, to mean the plant called at present by botanists Ricinus or Palma-Christi.

inaccurate account of Mathewe's Bible *, in the words which follow: "Further, when

* "Anno 1537, the Bible, containing the Old and "New Testament, called Matthew's Bible, of Tyndal's "and Rogers's translation, came forth. It was printed by "Grafton and Whitchurch at Hamborough.—The corrector "of the press was John Rogers, a learned divine.—William "Tyndal, with the help of Miles Coverdale, had translated "part of it (as I before noted), and what they did had been "printed anno 1532. The whole was finished and printed "anno 1535, with a dedication to King Henry VIII. by "Miles Coverdale (Tyndal being then in prison), and was "called Coverdale's Bible. After this a second impression "was designed, but before it could be finished, Tyndal was "put to death in Flanders for his religion; and his name then "growing into ignominy, as one burnt for a heretic, they "thought it might prejudice the book if he should be named "for the translator thereof, and so they used a feigned name, "calling it Thomas Matthew's Bible, though Tyndal before "his death, some say, had finished all but the Apocrypha, "which was translated by Rogers, but others say he had "gone no farther than the end of Nehemiah. Bale says "Rogers translated the Bible into English, from Genesis to "the end of the Revelations, making use of the Hebrew, "Greek, Latin, German, and English (i. e. Tyndal's) copies. "He added prefaces and marginal notes out of Luther, and "dedicated the whole book to King Henry VIII. under the "name of Thomas Matthews, by an epistle prefixed, mind-"ing to conceal his own name." Johnson's Historical Account of English Translations, in Bishop Watson's Tracts, p. 72, 73.—Vol. iii.

The inaccuracy of mentioning Coverdale's Bible, as if it was the completion of what Tyndal had begun, is obvious from what I have said already. It is equally incorrect to

"Rogers had completed what Tyndal left un-
"finished, he added notes and prefaces from
"Luther. The translation of the whole
"Bible, thus made by Tyndal and Rogers, was

speak of Mathewe's Bible, as a second edition of Coverdale's, when so great a part of the former does not contain a word of Coverdale's version. The Apocrypha, in Mathewe's Bible, was *not* translated by Rogers; and Tyndal had neither proceeded so far as Apocrypha, nor yet to the end of Nehemiah.

Lewis has made an odd remark on Mathewe's Bible, where he says, "The curators of this edition, among whom
"I reckon Archbishop Cranmer, paid an *equal respect* to the
"labours of both these translators by printing the translation
"of Tyndal so far as he went, and supplying what he had
"left undone with the translation made by Coverdale. As to
"the name of Thomas Matthews, it seems a fictitious one;
"since the translation, according to this edition, was made
"by several hands, therefore seems this name to have been
"thought of as being the name of *neither*, and under which
"the editor chose to appear."—Lewis's History of English Translations, 3d Edit. p. 111.

It is surely very inconsistent to observe, that *equal* respect was paid to the labours of each of these translators, in the same sentence in which he tells us with great truth, that no portion of Coverdale's translation was retained, where Tyndal's came into competition with it. His account of the reason for affixing the imaginary name of Mathewe is probably true. When Coverdale escaped from Mary's persecution, and Rogers fell into her hands, the Papists affected to consider the latter as the real Mathewe; and condemned him to the flames with that name as an *alias* added to his proper appellation.

"published at Hamburg under the feigned "name of Matthew: and hence it has been "called Matthew's Bible *." If I remark here, that Mathewe's Bible is not certainly known to have been printed at Hamburgh, I merely do it to point out to your Lordship how careless a guide you have condescended to accept. Lewis says, "Mr. Strype *guessed* that this Bible "was printed at Hamburgh †. But the late "Mr. Wanley thought it was more probable that "it was printed at Paris. Though it is very "plain that the types are German; and very "probable it was printed where the Pentateuch "and Practice of Prelates were printed, viz. "Marborch or Malborow ‡."

* Lecture XIV. p. 34.

† I do not, however, mean to insinuate that Johnson's was a mere guess, or that he had no better authority than Strype's conjecture. On the contrary, from the rest of Johnson's account I am convinced that he had before him, Foxe's Acts and Mon. vol. ii. p. 1087; but, as Foxe says, it was "printed at Hamborough about the year of our Lord 1532," his ignorance of the date, and many other mistakes in the same passage, should have taught Johnson not to give credit to Foxe's statement on this head, except on such points as he might be able to verify by some other means.

‡ Lewis, Edit. 3, p. 107. He then adds, that this may

But that part of Johnson's statement in which he has referred to Balé is the most material to our present question; as connecting the name and labours of Luther with those of our early translators. I will, therefore, give the passage referred to as it is quoted by Lewis, subjoining his remarks on what Bale has said.

Bishop Bale tells us, that, "Rogers having "followed Tyndal, very faithfully translated "into the vulgar tongue the great work of "the Bible from the beginning to the end, "from the first of Genesis to the last of the "Revelations, having recourse to the He- "brew, Greek, Latin, German, and English "copies: and that this laborious work, with "the addition of very useful prefaces and "annotations from Martin Luther, he dedi- "cated to K. Henry VIII. in an epistle pre- "fixed in the name of Thomas Matthew. But "it is plain, that in this account there are the

mean either Marburg in Hesse, or Marbeck in the dutchy of Wittemburgh, where Rogers was superintendant. In making this last conjecture he seems to have forgot that the words *in the Land of Hesse* are adjoined to *Malborow* in the Pentateuch of 1530.

"following mistakes: I. The Bible called "Matthew's is not a new translation, but made "up of Tyndal's and Coverdale's, as has been "said already *, improved with some amend-"ments. II. The prefaces and notes are not "Luther's but Tyndal's †."

If Lewis had not so positively asserted, that the prefaces and notes in Mathewe's Bible were not Luther's, I should have suspected, that though they differed in every instance but one from any thing of Luther's that I could meet with, this might be explained by supposing, that they were borrowed from articles changed or suppressed in such editions of Luther's Bible as had fallen within my no-

* Lewis had before remarked, that the opinion which gave Rogers credit for the translation of the Apocrypha was incorrect. "It commonly passes for current," says he, "that "the O. and N. Test. were translated by Tyndal and "Coverdale, and the Apocrypha by John Rogers. But it is "plain that the Apocrypha in Matthew's Bible is of the same "translation with that in Coverdale's, and that Coverdale "gives not the least hint of any one's assisting him in this "translation, but always speaks of it as entirely his own." P. 223.

† Lewis, page 224.

tice. The result of my own examination has not, indeed, led me to confirm the truth of Lewis's assertion in its full extent.

The exception to which I allude is the long and remarkable "prologe" to the Epistle to the Romans. Lewis has said the truth, in asserting, that it was not added in Mathewe's Bible by Rogers, because it may be seen in Tyndal's New Testament of 1534; but he has not stated the whole truth, for the greater part of this preface appears to have been translated by Tyndal from Luther. It was no doubt considered as a valuable theological tract; as a translation of it was inserted in the Wittenberg New Testament, &c. of 1529 *.

* Biblia Latina ad Hebraicam Veritatem emendata; Pentateuchus, Libri Josuæ, Judicum, Ruth et Regum; Nov. Test. cum Præfatione M. Lutheri. Fol. Wittembergæ, 1529.

The use of the Preface to Ep. to Romans, in this Latin version, is mentioned as a proof of the attention it met with from the divines of that day; on the supposition that the above version is not Luther's own work. Walchius thought it probably was; but he refers for arguments on the contrary side to Walteri Erörterung der streitigkeit von der lateinischen bibel des jahrs 1529, worinnen bewiesen wird, dass sie

It is so difficult to meet with perfect copies of Tyndal's New Testament of an earlier date than 1530, that I am not able to say whether Tyndal had made use of this preface before it was translated into Latin. If he did, we may add German to the list of tongues in which he was skilled; yet, when Buschius described him as master of seven languages (of which number German was not one), he seemed to have gone as far as he could with truth; since, to swell out the catalogue, he gave Tyndal credit for knowing English, his native tongue. But, in whatever manner Tyndal may have got access to this "prologe," nicht, der lateinischen version nach, eine wahre schrift D. Luthers sey. Jenæ, 1749. And to the same writer's Bestärckter beweis, dass die zu Wittenberg 1529 herausgekommene bibel neder von D. Luthero selbst; noch unter seiner aufsicht verfertiget und herausgegeben worden sey. Jenæ, 1752.

This work may have assisted Coverdale; his translations of Numb. x. 31, and Exod. xxxiv. 30, might have been made either from the Wittenberg Latin or from Luther's German. If the Wittenberg Pentateuch was then thought independent of Luther's version, their coincidence in any doubtful or difficult passages, would be an argument with Coverdale for the correctness of their mode of rendering the text.

it forms the only exception to the truth of Lewis's assertion about the prefaces, which I have been able to detect. As to the *notes* in Mathewe's Bible, the first books of Scripture to which there are appended annotations of any length are Job and the Psalms, and they do not resemble any of Luther's notes that I have seen; but as these portions of Scripture were not of Tyndal's translation, it is immaterial to the question which I have before me, whether the notes to them are original, or from what quarter they are drawn *.

Having shown, that above half the Bible was cleared in its very next edition of any deviations from the original which the secondary description of Coverdale's version

* In pages 445 et seq. of Tyndal's works, published by John Daye, London, 1573 (being part of a treatise, "Upon "Signes and Sacraments"), the doctrines of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, and the opinions since sanctioned by the reformed Churches, are so clearly and fairly stated, and Luther's errors on the subject are pointed out by Tyndal so judiciously, that no person who looks at the passage, will suspect Tyndal of servilely copying Luther's notes on the New Testament, or of following him on any subject, with the blindness of a partisan.

might have introduced, we have now to inquire whether its infection continued so strong in the remainder of the Bible up to the time when King James's translators began their work, as to make it likely, that its influence was injurious to their clear view of that portion of their labours which extends from Ezra to the end of Apocrypha *.

Of the intermediate Bibles, then, which next require our attention, I have no objection to calling Cranmer's, with your Lordship, *a correction* only of Mathewe's; which it followed in two years; and perhaps where the editors of Cranmer's Bible attempted to correct what Tyndal had done, their alterations might, in such places, be "for the worse." As far as I have observed, the greatest improvements were made in the Psalms; the apocryphal books seem to have been passed over, as scarcely deserving the labour of a careful revision. To give some notion of the pains taken to form a correct translation of

* See Appendix, Art. C.

the Psalms, I will subjoin a few verses as they stand in Coverdale's, Cranmer's, and the authorized Version.

Ps. i. 1.

Coverdale. Blessed is the man that goeth not in the council of the ungodly: that abydeth not in the way of sinners, and sitteth not in the seat of the scornful.

Cranmer. Blessed is the man, that hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly, nor stood in the way of sinners, and hath not sat in the seat of the scornful.

Auth. V. Blessed is the man, that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.

Ps. ii. 1.

Coverdale. Why do the heathen grudge? Why do the people imagine a vain thing?

Cranmer. Why do the heathen so furiously rage together; and why do the people imagine a vain thing?

Auth. V. Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?

Ps. iii. 1.

Coverdale. Why are they so many, O Lord, that trouble me? A great multitude are they that rise against me.

Cranmer. Lord, how are they increased that trouble me? Many are they that rise against me.

Auth. V. ——that rise up against me.

Some alterations are more considerable; for instance, Ps. lxxi. ver. 22, 23.

Coverdale. Therefore will I praise thee and thy faithfulness, O God, playing upon the lute: unto thee will I sing upon the harp, O thou Holy One of Israel.

My lips would fayne sing praises unto thee; and so would my soul whom thou hast delivered.

Cranmer. ——playing upon an instrument of musick——

My lips will be fain when I sing unto thee: and so will my soul——

Auth. V. I will also praise thee with the psaltery, even thy truth, O my God: unto thee will I sing with the harp——

My lips shall greatly rejoice when I sing unto thee; and my soul, which thou hast redeemed.

It is obvious from the above examples, that the correction, by Cranmer's editors, of Mathewe's translation (i. e. of Coverdale's, for the Psalms formed part of his share of that Bible) was not sufficient; but then neither was it accepted as such by King James's translators. The Psalms of Cranmer's Bible are, in fact, those inserted in our books of Common Prayer; and the difference between that translation and the one in our present Bible falls under every body's notice. The changes made in the language are so great, and afford evidence of such close attention to minute deviations from the sacred text, that any reader may satisfy himself, that the King's rules about following previous translations can have had no effect in checking any correction, that was desirable, however slight it might be; they only prevented the careless exchange of words, which already corresponded admirably with the Hebrew, for others as good, but no better than the terms for which they

might, without those rules, have been capriciously substituted.

If Crammer's or Taverner's Bibles were only so many new editions of Mathewe's Bible, they were followed by a thoroughly new and independent translation, which was published complete in 1561. This was the Geneva Bible, so called from its being the work of such of our Reformers, as, having fled from Mary's persecution, had assembled about Geneva *.

* The usual title of the Geneva Bibles, of which there were many editions, is, The Bible; that is, the Holy Scriptures conteined in the Olde and Newe Testament. Translated according to the Ebrew and Greke, and conferred with the best Translations in divers Languages, with most profitable Annotations upon all the harde Places, and other Thinges of great Importance.

Many of these "profitable annotations" were such as the sounder and milder divines of the English Church at home could not approve of. In a marginal note on II. Chron. xv. 16, Asa is reproved for having only deposed, and not put to death, the Queen Maachah his mother, for her idolatry. I have seen an edition of 1610, in which she is called his *grandmother*; as if in order to make the remark less notoriously applicable to King James, then the reigning monarch. But this and some other notes of what he thought a democratical tendency, naturally gave him a personal dislike to this Bible, and led him to underrate very much its merits as a translation.

Simon has said of this Bible, "Illa vero Gene-
"vensium (versio) quam omnium pessimam
"Rex Jacobus appellat, eadem est atque Ge-
"nevensis Gallica quæ in sermonem Anglicum
"conversa fuerat, legebaturque in Anglia a
"nonnullis protestantibus qui ritus Geneven-
"sium profitebantur." Disquisit. Criticæ. I have already given an instance of disagreement between the English Geneva and Olivetan's Bible in the translation of a difficult text; but I have not felt it necessary to look out for numerous discrepancies; because, any person who considers how exceedingly idiomatic the French language is, will not want many arguments to convince him, that, if our Geneva Bible keeps, in general, very close to the Hebrew idiom, it is quite impossible that the authors of it should have been able to pursue the peculiar turn of the Hebrew, through the medium of a French translation.

To show how distinct the translation in the Geneva Bible is from the preceding English ones, I will now proceed to collate the twelve

first verses, and one or two other texts in Jeremiah.

I. 1. דברי Literally, The words of.

Cov. } These are the sermons.
Cran. }

Gen. } The words of.
Auth. V. }

Ver. 2. אשר היה דברי־יהוה אליו Lit. As was the word of the Lord to him; *or*, who, the word of the Lord was to him.

Cov. } When the Lord had first spoken.
Cran. }

Gen. } To whom the word of the Lord came.
Auth. V. }

Ver. 3. ויהי בימי Lit. And it was in the days.

Cov. } And so during unto the time.
Cran. }

Gen. And also in the days.

Auth. V. It came also in the days.

עד־גלות ירושלם Lit. Unto the carrying away captive Jerusalem.

Cov. } When Jerusalem was taken.
Cran. }

Gen. } Unto the carrying away of Jeru-
Auth. V. } salem captive.

Ver. 4. ויהי דבר־יהוה אלי לאמר Lit. "And there was the word of the Lord to me, saying.

Cov. } The word of the Lord spake thus
Cran. } unto me.

Gen. } Then the word of the Lord came
Auth: V. } unto me, saying.

In this verse Coverdale had followed Luther's form, und sprach; but in the next verse, where Luther has translated

הקדשתיך Ich sonderte dich aus, Coverdale, as well as the later English Bibles, has "I sanc-" tified thee."

Ver. 6. הנה לא־ידעתי דבר Lit. Behold, I have not knowledge to speak.

Cov. I am unmete.

Cran. I cannot speak.

Gen. } Behold, I cannot speak.
Auth. V. }

כי־נער אנכי Lit. For a child, I.

Cov. } For I am yet but young.
Cran. }

Gen. } For I *am* a child.
Auth. V. }

Ver. 8. כי־אתך אני Lit. For with thee, I.

Cov. For I will be with thee.

Cran. } For I *am* with thee.
Gen. }
Auth. V. }

Ver. 9. ויאמר יהוה

This being the second time the word *Lord* occurs in this verse, it is omitted by Coverdale, as it had been by Luther.

Cran. And the same Lord said.

Gen. } And the Lord said.
Auth. V. }

Which is perfectly literal.

10. לנתוץ Buxtorff's Lex. נתץ Diruit, destruxit, demolitus est.

Cov. } To break off.
Cran. }

Gen. To root out.

Auth. V. To pull down.

Ver. 11. מקל שקד LXX. Βακτηριαν καρυϊνην.

Vulg. Virgam vigilantem.

Luther. Einen wackern stab.

Cov. A waking rod.

Cranmer. }
Geneva. } A rod of an almond tree.
Auth. V. }

Here Coverdale would probably feel no hesitation about following Luther and the Vulgate; as he would observe that those translations corresponded, and that when the words were so rendered, they seemed to accord very well with the context, Bene vidisti, quia vigilabo ego. But the editors of Cranmer's Bible, and the authors of the Geneva and of our present Bible, knowing that שקד properly meant, and had been, in every other instance, rendered *an almond tree*, did not feel themselves at liberty to forsake the Hebrew so widely, for the sake of making the allusion more clear *.

* Lest any readers should imagine that the original must be a very uncertain language, indeed, to allow translators to

Ver. 12. כי שקד אני .. Lit. For I am hastening.

Cov. For I will watch diligently.

Cran. For I will make haste speedily.

Gen., Auth. V. } For I will hasten.

Ver. 14. תפתח { The punctuation is passive; perhaps *shall be let loose*, would come closest to the Hebrew.

Cov. } Shall come.
Cran. }

Gen. Shall be spread.

doubt whether a word means two such different things as *watchful* or *almond tree*, it may be as well to explain here, that there is no ambiguity at all in the word. It is the usual difficulty of transferring a paronomasia into any other language, which has induced Jerome and Luther to give a substitute for the word שקד instead of translating it.

The almond being one of the earliest trees in the production of its blossoms, which in the south of Europe attract the eye by their unrivalled beauty in January, its Hebrew name is equivalent to *hastening* tree or *early* tree. To make the passage clear, let us suppose that some English plant was called *the hastening tree;* that a branch of it is placed as an emblem before the prophet's eye; and that it is said to him, "What seest thou?" he answers, "I see a branch of *an* "*hastening tree.*" The reply made to him is, "Thou hast "well seen, for I hasten to perform my word."

Auth. V. Shall break forth.

Margin. Shall be opened.

Ver. 17. אל־תחת מפניהם פן־אחתך לפניהם

The repetition of similar words here, gives energy to the expression, and I know not how to represent the passage better than as follows: Shrink not thou from their faces, lest I make thee shrink into nothing before their faces.

Cov. Fear them not, I will not have thee to be afraid of them.

Cran. Fear them not, lest I destroy thee before them.

Gen. Be not afraid of their faces, lest I destroy thee before them.

Auth. V. Be not dismayed at their faces, lest I confound thee before them.

Margin (*a*), Break thee to pieces.

Jer. LI. 58, affords an instance of a more difficult passage; of which I will only say, that the change of *for* to *and* is evidently correct; as made in the authorized Version.

וינעו עמים בדי־דים ולאמים בדי־אש ויעפו

LXX. Και ου κοπιασουσι λαοι εις κενον, και εθνη εν αρχῃ εκλειψουσιν.

Vulg. Et labores populorum ad nihilum, et gentium in ignem erunt, et disperibunt.

Luth. Dass der heiden arbeit verloren sey und verbrant werde, was die völcker mit mübe erbauet haben *.

Cov. And the thing, that the Gentiles and the people have wrought with great travail and labour, shall come to nought, and be consumed in the fire.

Cran. Same.

Geneva. And the people shall labour in vain, and the folk in the fire, for they shall be weary.

Auth. V. ——and they shall be weary.

The translation of the above texts, which is printed in Mathewe's Bible, is in each instance an exact copy of Coverdale's version; and Cranmer's Bible, as was anticipated, contains but a few corrections of the translation, as his

* In Noldius' Concordantia Particularum, p. 832' there are some remarks on this text and on Luther's mistaken view of it.

Either the present text of the LXX is erroneous here; or they must have translated from a very different Hebrew text. Indeed the arrangement of Jeremiah in the LXX makes the latter supposition almost a certainty.

editors found it in Mathewe's Bible; whilst the Geneva translators appear, as it was announced that they would do, to have kept as close as they could to the Hebrew, without caring how wide of their English predecessors this might carry them.

The only Bible which it remains for me to speak of, is Parker's or the Bishops' Bible. I have not examined it with any great care, because, as your Lordship has said, "it appears "from Archbishop Parker's instructions to have "been only a revision of Cranmer's Bible*." As different portions of it were done by different hands, it may be supposed to have been a very unequal revision. In the passages lately quoted from Jeremiah, Horne, Bishop of Winchester (to whose share this prophet and Isaiah fell), has not deviated in a single instance from Cranmer's text; the Geneva version was unfortunately too much disliked, to allow its improvements to be fairly received. But King James's translators were superior to

* Lect. XIV. p. 34.

any such prejudices. A glance back at the last collation will show, that though "the Bishops' "Bible was made the basis of our present au- "thorized Version*," our last excellent transla- tors construed the King's order, of altering it *as little as the original would permit*, so libe- rally, that they did not leave the slightest par- ticle unchanged, where such change could bring the English closer to the Hebrew†.

I trust then, my Lord, that I am borne out in saying;

* Lect. XIV. p. 34.

† See particularly ver. 4. "The word of the Lord spake "thus unto me;" in the Bishops' Bible, changed by K. James's translators, into "Then the word of the Lord came "unto me, saying."

V. 6. I cannot speak, *into*, Behold, I cannot speak.

V. 9. And the same Lord said, *into*, And the Lord said.

If this Letter should be perused by any persons, who from ignorance of Hebrew have been misled by the pretensions lately put forward by a Mr. Bellamy, they may derive two valuable observations from the different collations which I have found it necessary to make. First, That the Hebrew language is not so vague or uncertain, as to occasion or admit of any such prodigious variations in the mode of ren- dering as that gentleman has proposed. The most independ- ent translators, where they are competent to their task, sel- dom differing but in very minute points.

And secondly, That wherever any of these nice distinc- tions do occur, our admirable authorized Version is, almost invariably, found to be the most accurate.

First, That King James's translators did not feel themselves restrained by any regulations about following the previous Bibles, from making as close a translation as their industry and profound skill in the Hebrew language could enable them to produce; but were merely prevented from indulging in the capricious interchange of perfectly synonimous terms.

And secondly, That even if they had felt themselves bound to copy the previous English Bibles much more closely than I can possibly think they did; they had, at any rate, the power of making their selection from two primary, genuine, and independent translations; the one of a great portion, the other of the whole of the Scriptures; viz. Tyndal's versions and the Geneva Bible.

In evidence of the skill and fidelity with which they employed their talents and advantages, allow me to produce a testimony which must be considered as impartial, since it comes from a foreign divine; as not given without due examination and full reflection, since it comes

from a person, who seems to have devoted his life to inquiries of this nature; and which may well have the more weight in the present question, as it comes from a critic, who having edited Luther's works, would readily have detected any plagiaries from him. Inter interpretationes, quibus Scripturæ Sacræ in linguas nationibus Europæ vernaculas translatæ sunt, *eminet omnino Anglica*, ac monstrat auctorum non mediocrem eruditionem; *peritiam sermonum sacrorum*, Ebræi ac Græci, judicium atque industriam *.

I will put it to your Lordship's candour, whether a compilation from any set of secondary translations whatsoever, would have earned such praise from a laborious biblical scholar like Walchius.

As to the quotation from Macknight †, I am sure you cannot consider his authority as deserving to be put into competition with that

* Walchii Bibliotheca Theologica, cap. viii. § 13. tom. iv. p. 124.

† See page 7.

of the learned German just referred to. "The truth is, that Dr. Macknight began his inquiry with the following object avowedly in view; "The author supposes the utility of a new Eng-
" lish translation of the apostolical Epistles will
" be sufficiently evinced, if it can be shown that
" the first English translators made their ver-
" sions from the Vulgate, and that the subse-
" quent translators, by copying them, have re-
" tained a number of the errors of that ancient
" version *." I have shown (in Appendix C.) that his premises were eked out with many most unfounded assertions. Indeed it seems as if he himself perceived that the ground was failing under him, when he drew from all his statements no stronger conclusion than, that the authorized Version ought not " to be
" implicitly relied on for determining contro-
" versies."

For Archbishop Newcome's labours in elucidating the Hebrew Scriptures, I feel sincere

* Macknight's General Preface to his New Translation of the Apostlolical Epistles, p. 12, 2d Edition.

respect; and his rules for improving our present translation are most judiciously drawn up. But he was himself a translator; and in estimating the result of his own exertions he was very naturally, though perhaps unconsciously, led to regard the labours of his predecessors with somewhat of the feeling which Dr. Macknight has avowed. The work referred to by your Lordship * consists principally of extracts, which he had collected from such writers, as have held that our English Bible stands very much indeed in want of improvement and correction. The greater number of his authorities, to this purpose, are taken from rival translators. These may have been excellent men, and several, but by no means all of them, were very competent judges; yet they are the last class of writers amongst whom one would look for unprejudiced and thoroughly impartial evidence on this subject †.

* Macknight's General Preface to his New Translation of the Apostolical Epistles, p. 12, 2d Edition.

† Dr. Geddes was a man with so strangely constituted a mind, that I set no value on his testimony to the positive merits of Tyndal; but all his peculiarities were such as would lead him to dislike a mere copyist from other translations.

But whilst most persons would receive their opinions with hesitation; and would almost take for granted, that allowances must be made for some exaggeration, in their list of objections to a version, which they wished that their own productions might supersede; the sanction which the Lady Margaret's Professor may think fit to give to such objections, is heard as if he had delivered a painful truth, wrested from him by a strong conviction of its being indisputable.

I have seen Archbishop Newcome's remarks on this subject, taken advantage of by more than one enemy; and the fear of a similar

I subjoin, therefore, his favourable opinion of Tyndal, as I find it in Abp. Newcome's work, considering it as good evidence, that he saw in Tyndal no second-hand translator.

"Dr. Geddes thinks, that though Tyndal's is far from "being a perfect translation, yet few first translations will be "found preferable to it. It is astonishing," says this writer, "how little obsolete the language of it is, even at this "day: and, in point of perspicuity and noble simplicity, "propriety of idiom and purity of style, no English version "has yet surpassed it." And he elsewhere "declares (Gene-"ral Answer, &c. p. 4), that if he had been inclined to make "any prior English version the groundwork of his own, it "would certainly have been Tyndal's."—Abp. Newcome's Historical View of English Translations, p. 25.

abuse of your Lordship's candid, but, as I think, mistaken statement, made me wish to place before the public such arguments against the correctness of that statement, as had weight with myself. I have been the more desirous of doing this from observing, that a new edition of your translation of Michaelis is announced; and that each successive edition hitherto, has contained the note * which degrades our authorized Version into little better than a copy from Luther.

But whilst I have taken the liberty of disputing so decidedly the accuracy of what you have said on this subject, I am bound to acknowledge, and do it with great pleasure, that the statements to which I have had occasion to object, are confined to those which you had accepted on the authority of Johnson's tract. The fact is, that our great English divines have either not liked to employ themselves about the foundations for ever, or they have gone deeper in their controversies, and appealed at

* See Appendix to this Letter, Art. B.

once to the originals; so that the question, by what means our translators were enabled to present those, who could look no farther, with so faithful a copy, has not been much examined till lately. The knowledge of former editions of vernacular Bibles, and of previous translations, is what had scarcely been thought of in this country, when Johnson and Lewis wrote. The laborious accuracy on such topics of Le Long, of Masch, or of Walchius, has still had nothing amongst us resembling it; and by giving our countryman Johnson credit for the exactness which you had found in those writers, your Lordship assigned to him a share of merit which he by no means deserved; and allowed yourself to acquiesce in statements, which he was not qualified to give without great inaccuracy. Perhaps the only person who could have given the public such information on these subjects, as might have been referred to without hesitation, was our truly learned fellow collegian Mr. Baker, the venerated *socius ejectus*. From him Lewis seems to have derived, in common with so many writers of that time, such assistance as contributed consider-

ably to his general accuracy. But Lewis is a very *indistinct* writer. Archbishop Newcome has provided me with the epithet; and never was any epithet more fully deserved. His information about a particular edition is sometimes scattered over a great number of unconnected and widely distant passages; and what he means is often unintelligible, without looking carefully over the work which he professes to describe. This is the best apology that can be made for Dr. Macknight, who evidently consulted Lewis; but had, in all probability, no access to several of the old translations of which he has spoken.

After having ascertained by personal inspection the inaccuracy of Johnson's statements, I might perhaps, by declaring and giving a very few instances of their incorrectness, have sufficiently proved some of the points on which I have dwelt at considerable length. But the respect due to your Lordship, and the weight of your authority, made it both improper and unlikely that I should obtain credit, had I met any statements which had received your sanc-

tion, with direct assertions of an opposite nature.

Let this be my excuse with such readers as think that I have unnecessarily protracted the discussion, in proof of the correctness of several assertions, which they may have seen but little reason for disputing.

To your Lordship I have only to add, that, aware of the responsibility which I incur by publishing my opinion that you have been mistaken, my principal anxiety has been to state the truth in the best manner for securing its acceptance; and yet, to let no argument escape my pen of a description inconsistent with that sincere respect, with which

I have the honour to be,

Your Lordship's obedient

And devoted Servant,

HENRY WALTER.

APPENDIX.

ARTICLE A.

IT would be useless to attempt proving, of any version, made in the sixteenth century, that it was not a translation from the Vulgate; if we were obliged to accept, in its full rigour, that limitation to the power of translating the Scriptures, from the Hebrew, which the Lady Margaret's Professor appears to have adopted from Michaelis. The passage, to which I allude, is the following:

"The use of the Latin Vulgate, in translating from "the Hebrew, was at *that* period not merely matter of "*convenience*. It was matter also of *necessity*. With- "out the Vulgate Luther would not have possessed *the* "*means* of translating from the Hebrew. The knowledge "of Hebrew had for ages preceding the period of re- "formation been confined to the learned among the *Jews*; "and when Luther undertook the task of translating "from the original Scriptures, this knowledge had begun "only to *dawn* among Christians. The comprehensive "grammars and lexicons to which we have *now* access, "are sources of intelligence which were not *open* to our "early Reformers. The elder Buxtorf, one of the *fa-* "*thers* of Hebrew learning among Christians, was not "born till after Luther's *death*: and Luther's only helps "in the form of a Hebrew Lexicon, were those of

"Reuchlin and Münster extracted from the meagre "glossaries of the Rabbins. Under such circumstances "a translation from the Hebrew without the intervention "of the Latin would have been wholly impracticable *."

I have no disposition to decline accepting the Bishop's account of the extent or sources of Luther's knowledge of Hebrew, but should be glad to see the broader question re-considered, as to the practicability of attaining, at that time, to a generally correct understanding of the Hebrew Scriptures, without looking to the Vulgate for help. If this was "wholly impracticable," I cannot understand how Pagninus or Münster became able to produce translations so superior in fidelity to the Vulgate; still less, how they should have been able to throw so much new light on the obscurities in the Hebrew text.

That the glossaries and the commentaries of the Rabbins were frequently very fanciful, I learn from numerous instances which have occasionally fallen under my notice; and the facilities which Buxtorf and other lexicographers have afforded, of knowing something of Hebrew without wading through long rabbinical scholia on the Scriptures, prevent my being able to speak very positively of their merits; yet I do not know that the Buxtorfs, though they have made the road easier, have given any information superior to what might have been obtained by Tyndal, or such of his cotemporaries as had industry enough to surmount these difficulties, against which the Buxtorfs, themselves, had to contend.

Besides such perpetual commentaries on the sacred text as were in the possession of individual Rabbins, the rabbinical Bibles printed at Venice were accessible at that

* Bishop of Peterborough's Lectures, XIV. p. 32.

time to Christians as well as Jews. Will it be denied that the Rabbins of Luther's day had preserved the knowledge of the Hebrew text, which had descended amongst the people of their nation by continued tradition? That reading constantly the debased, yet kindred, language in which the scholia on their Scriptures were written, they needed little help from Christians to understand the grammatical construction, however deplorably blind they might be to the spirit of their Scriptures? Or will it be said that they endeavoured to conceal from Christian readers knowledge, of which they alone possessed the keys? The publication of those long commentaries, which form a greater part of the rabbinical Bibles than the text itself is decisive against the last supposition. But if the language of the Lower Empire and of the scholiasts, had wandered as far from that of Plato or Aristotle, as the rabbinical Hebrew from that of the Pentateuch, would it have been thought reasonable to say of those scholars who lived in Italy, when the sacking of Constantinople filled it with learned Greeks, that they could not have translated Aristotle into Italian but for the help of some old Latin translation, because their only helps, in the form of Greek and Italian lexicons, might have been some meagre glossaries? It would, surely, be said in answer to any such remark, that being able to read Aristotle and his scholiasts, with the persons who spoke the language of those scholiasts as their guides and assistants, they were more competent to correct, than necessitated to consult, any previous Latin translation.

In one material respect, however, an illustration drawn from Greek literature, has a tendency to give too disadvantageous an idea of the skill attainable in Hebrew in Tyndal's time, as compared with the knowledge which

the same industry might now acquire; for, the publication of various excellent Greek lexicons and grammars has given modern classical scholars much greater advantages over their predecessors, than the accumulated labours of any Hebrew lexicographers, can, by any possibility, effect for those who study Hebrew. This remark may deserve the attention of such persons as not knowing the latter language, but perceiving the improvements which might be made in our Version of the Greek Testament, feel perhaps inclined to suspect that still greater improvements might be made in our translation of the Hebrew Scriptures; in proportion to what they imagine the greater difficulty of mastering the rarer acquisition.

But whilst the nice distinctions, which exist in the Greek language, between its numerous expressions for passed, approaching, or passing time, and between compounds expressing every shade of variety in either cause or effect, can only be properly appreciated by having a great number of examples collected for comparison; the verb in Hebrew has but three tenses, and the language admits of no compounds. The Hebrew, therefore, expresses the general idea, but leaves the precise modification of that idea to be drawn from the context. Thus, when Buxtorf says that הפך signifies, vertit, evertit, convertit, invertit, obvertit, subvertit, mutavit, commutavit, immutavit, *et interdum*, convertere se, verti, mutari; it is plain, that this is no more than saying, that the general idea of *causing a change of position or form either in one's self, or in other things*, is expressed by הפך; but that all those modifications of that idea, for which the Latin language has so many names, are, in reality, undistinguished in the Hebrew. Now, as no English word is equally general in its application, a

translator cannot employ any English word, as its constant representative; and, therefore, in any particular passage he must ascertain from the context, what modification of the idea of changing or turning is to be expressed in English. If the Latin words, evertit, invertit, subvertit, and obvertit, were employed in any passage; the accuracy of a translator would depend upon his just conception of the distinction between these several verbs; and for the power of appreciating that distinction, he must be indebted to the opportunities of comparing the force of these words afforded him by the selections and illustrations of lexicographers and critics, or by his own ready reference to other instances of their occurrence. This would be a question of scholarship.

But when once a person understands that the verb הפך means, to cause a change in *any* manner, ten thousand examples will not teach the Hebrew student to elicit from the verb itself, in *what* manner; because it does not, *in reality*, specify *the manner* in which the change is made, though the surrounding words may, very likely, point it out. To detect the *manner* from the context, is an effort of ingenuity or of common sense. He who has seen but one imperfect Hebrew Lexicon, and the most learned Hebraist living, must alike be guided by their reasoning powers in deciding what particular mode of change is to be understood in each particular case.

From the Arabic, indeed, some knowledge has been obtained since Tyndal's or Luther's time of the verbs from which certain nouns are derived, whose roots happened not to occur in the Hebrew Scriptures. But this knowledge is rarely applicable to any purpose; except where a poetical accumulation of nearly synonimous

words, has carried the writer beyond the language in ordinary use.

On the whole I see little reason for thinking, that the philological apparatus accumulated since King James's time, has carried the knowledge of Hebrew perceptibly farther than it was possessed by his translators.

A revision of our authorized Version of the Hebrew Scriptures might, perhaps, more reasonably be expected to add beauty than fidelity to the translation; since the principal advantage which the moderns enjoy consists in the light that Bishop Lowth has thrown on the arrangement of ideas in the poetry of Scripture. The most pleasing specimen of sacred criticism I ever read, Bishop Jebb's work on the Style of the New Testament, has taught me that the advantage to be derived from attention to this peculiar poetical arrangement, is not confined to the Hebrew portions of Scripture.

ARTICLE B.

"As our present English translation of the Bible "was made in the time of James I. by a society of "forty-seven persons appointed for that purpose by royal "authority, who were divided into six different com- "panies, which met in Westminster, Oxford, and Cam- "bridge, and none of them probably were sufficiently "acquainted with the German to derive any assistance "from Luther's translation, it may seem difficult to "comprehend how the Germanisms, of which our author "speaks, should have been derived from this source;

" and it may appear more reasonable to conclude that
" those turns of expression, which are no longer current
" in modern writings, were remnants of the Anglo-Saxon
" idiom, of which more traces are visible in the works
" of that age, than in those of the present century. But
" it appears from the following circumstances, that our
" author's assertion is not wholly devoid of foundation.
" 1. Luther published his German translation of the
" New Testament in 1523. 2. A few years previous to
" this publication William Tyndal, who had studied
" both in Oxford and Cambridge, went abroad, spent
" some time in Germany, was personally acquainted with
" Luther, settled afterwards in Antwerp, and published
" an English translation of the N. T. in 1526. 3. John
" Rogers, who studied in Cambridge and spent a consi-
" derable time in Germany, where he became minister
" of a Lutheran congregation, translated that part of the
" Old Testament which Tyndal had left unfinished, re-
" vised his translation of the New, added notes and pre-
" faces from Luther, and published the whole at Ham-
" burg in 1537, which edition is commonly called Ma-
" thewe's Bible, Mathewe being a fictitious name as-
" sumed by Rogers. 4. It is certain, therefore, that
" Rogers made use of Luther's version; and it is highly
" probable that Tyndal did the same, as he first trans-
" lated those books which Luther had first translated,
" and began the translation of the Prophets only a short
" time before his death in 1536, which Luther had not
" finished before 1532. Lastly, it appears from the
" 14th rule given by James I. to the translators of our
" present English Bible, that where the English transla-
" tions of Tyndal, Mathewe, &c. by which last is
" meant the edition of 1537, came closer to the original

" than the Bishops' Bible, their mode of translation " should be retained.

" See Walchii Bibliotheca Theologica, tom. iv. p. 82, " and Johnson's Historical Account of the English " Translations of the Bible, in Bishop Watson's Tracts, " vol. iii. pp. 67—72, 94—96. See also p. 309 of " the preceding work, and vol. i. p. 418, of Le Long, " Biblioth. Sacra, ed. Paris, 1723." Bishop of Peterborough's Note on Michaelis's Introduction to N. T. chap. vii. sect. 21.

I need not make any remarks here on such parts of the above note as are incorporated in Lect. XIV. But there is one farther statement made in the note, which must have been derived from some inaccurate authority. It is said, that Tyndal went abroad a few years previous to Luther's publication of the N. T. in 1523. I have not been able to ascertain with precision in what year he went abroad. His biographer, Foxe, scarcely gives a single date of any event connected with him. But Tyndal says, that when he had determined to devote himself to translating the Bible, he left his situation as tutor in the family of a Gloucestershire gentleman, and went to London with the hope of finding a protector, during his labours, in Bishop Tonstall. Now Tonstall, who was previously Dean of Salisbury and Master of the Rolls, only became Bishop of London in 1522; and Tyndal, though disappointed, remained in London nearly a twelvemonth, before he quitted England for Germany.

As any person who has not access to the authors referred to in the above note on Michaelis, may imagine that facts or arguments would be found under the above references, which might materially alter his view of the case, I will add here,

That the reference to Walchius only supplies the order in which Luther made his translations.

That the references to Bishop Watson's collection, are to Johnson's Tract, the inaccuracy of which I have had so much occasion to notice; and to a note, attached to another tract, in which several of Johnson's assertions are repeated in a more concise form.

That the reference to Le Long is to his account of the English version *, in which occurs an extract from Cochlæus, telling how he drove two English heretics out of Cologne, who were employed in printing an English translation of Luther's New Testament.

The story is told by Jodocus Cochlæus, in Actis Martini Lutheri, Anno 1526, p. 123, and is as follows:

"Duo Angli Apostatæ, qui aliquandiu fuerant Wittenbergæ cunctos Angliæ populos, volente nolente Rege, brevi per *Novum Lutheri Test. quod in Anglicanam traduxerant linguam*, Lutheranos fore sperabant. Venerant jam Coloniam Agrippinam ut Test. sic traductum, per typographos in multa millia multiplicatum, occultè sub aliis mercibus deveherent inde in Angliam. Tanta eis erat rei bene gerendæ fiducia ut primo aggressu peterent a typographis, sex millia sub prelum dari." "Illi autem subverentes, ne gravissimo afficerentur damno, si quid adversi accideret, tantum tria millia sub prelum miserant. Typographis Coloniensibus notior ac familiarior factus *(Cochlæus,)* audivit eos aliquando inter pocula fiducialiter jactitare, Velint nolint Rex et Cardinalis Angliæ, totam Angliam brevi fore Lutheranam. Audivit item, duos ibi latitare Anglos † eruditos, *linguarumque*

* I suppose that the reference to p. 418 is a misprint for 428; since 418 is on the subject of the Swedish Bibles, translated from Luther's German version.

† These must have been Tyndal and John Fryth.

peritos, et disertos, quos tamen videre aut alloqui nunquam potuit. Vocatis itaque in hospitium, suum quibusdam typographis, posteaquam mero incaluissent, unus eorum in secretiore colloquio revelavit illi arcanum, quo ad Lutheri partes trahenda esset Anglia. Nempe versari sub prelo tria millia exemplarium *Novi Testamenti Lutherani*, ac processum esse jam usque ad literam alphabeti K in ordine quaternionum. Impensas abundè suppeti a mercatoribus Anglicanis, qui opus excusum clam invecturi per totam Angliam latenter dispergere vellent, antequam Rex aut Cardinalis rem scire, aut prohibere possit.

"Cochlæus intra se metu et admiratione variè affectus —abiit clam ad Hermannum Rinck, eique rem omnem, ut acceperat vini beneficio, indicavit. Ille, ut certiùs omnia constarent, alium misit exploratum in eam domum, ubi opus excudebatur, juxta indicium Cochlæi. Cumque ab illo accepisset, rem ita se habere, et ingentem papyri copiam ibi existere; adiit Senatum, atque effecit ut typographis indiceretur, ne ultra progrederentur in eo opere. Duo Apostatæ Angli, arreptis secum quaternionibus impressis, aufugerunt; navigio per Rhenum ascendentes Wormatiam—ut ibi per alium typographum perficerent opus cæptum."

But the expression Testamentum Lutheranum, or even the more definite words, Nov. Lutheri Testamentum, as used by Cochlæus, are but weak authority for Le Long's formally registering, as it were, "Novum Testamentum ex Germanicâ versione Lutheri in Anglicum Sermonem a duobus Anglis traductum; et editum Coloniæ usque ad litteram K. impensis mercatorum Anglicanorum." Le Long, Par. edition, 1723, vol. i. p. 433. The term

Lutheran, as then employed by violent Roman Catholics like Cochlæus, was frequently merely a term of abhorrence. All that he has said, was very likely, in his mind, no more than equivalent to calling it a wretched heretical translation.

ARTICLE C.

I have already given some extracts from the preface to another translation of the New Testament, made by Coverdale, and published under the name of Hollybushe, in 1538. A more full account of this translation, which was professedly made "after the vulgare text, com-"munely called St. Jerome's *," was not necessary in discussing the origin of such previous Bibles, as King James's translators were called upon to copy, whenever they could do it with perfect propriety. But wishing to show how little value ought to be set on Dr. Macknight's authority regarding the present question, I shall here subjoin, amongst other proofs of the groundless nature of many of his assertions, a quotation from Hollybushe's New Testament. The account which he found in Lewis, of this work of Coverdale's, has been misunderstood and misapplied by him, so as to form the basis of assumptions, that have no foundation at all in facts.

* A correct copy of the title may be seen in Lewis, p. 112, edition 3d.

After giving some disjointed extracts from the prefaces of two editions of Hollybushe's New Testament (which Macknight has filled out with sentences of his own, containing statements in which he was utterly mistaken), he proceeds; "From these quotations it is evi-
"dent, that the translation of the New Testament which
"Coverdale allowed Hollybushe to print with the Latin
"text, was the one which he had published in his Bible;
"consequently it was Tyndal's translation *." Now, it would not be very difficult to prove, that no such results were properly deducible from his quotations; but it is simpler to refer at once to the translations themselves; and, on inspection it appears,

First, "That the translation of the New Testament "which Coverdale allowed Hollybushe to print †, was" not "the one which he had published in his Bible."

Secondly, "That the one which he had published in "his Bible, was" not "Tyndal's translation."

Thirdly, "That as the premises on which Macknight "built his conclusion were false, so also is the conclusion "itself; since, in point of fact, the translation in Holly-"bushe's New Testament is different from Tyndal's."

For a proof of these facts nothing more is necessary than to look at any verse in these different translations, that happens not to be of so very simple a construction, as would admit of no variation in the mode of rendering it.

I have turned to the twelfth Chapter to the Epistle.

* Note to Section 2d of Macknight's Gen. Preface to Translation of Epistles, p. 19, edition 2d.

† Or rather allowed J. Nicholson to print, with the feigned name of Hollybushe as translator.

to the Hebrews; and find, upon examination, that the first two verses will suit our purpose.

Τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς τοσοῦτον ἐχοντες περικειμενον ἡμῖν νεφος μαρτυρων, ογκον αποθεμενοι παντα, καὶ την ευπεριστατον αμαρτιαν, δι' ὑπομονῆς τρεχωμεν τον προκειμενον ἡμῖν αγῶνα·

Αφορωντες εις τον τῆς πιστεως αρχηγον καὶ τελειωτην Ιησουν, ὁς αντὶ τῆς προκειμενης αυτῶ χαρᾶς, ὑπεμεινε σταυρον, αισχυνης καταφρονησας, εν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρονου τοῦ Θεοῦ εκαθισεν.

Which, in Tyndal's translation, is as follows:

Wherefore let us also, (seeing that we are compassed with so great a multitude of witnesses,) lay away all that presseth down, and the sin that hangeth on, and let us run with patience unto the battle that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the auctor and finisher of our faith, which for the joy that was set before him, abode the cross, and despised the shame, and is set down on the right hand of the throne of God.

In Coverdale's Bible it is,

Wherefore seeing we have so great a multitude of witnesses about us, let us also lay away all that presseth down, and the sin that hangeth on, and let us run with patience unto the battle that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the auctor and finisher of faith; which, when the joy was laid before him, abode the cross, and despised the shame, and is set down on the right hand of the throne of God.

The next Bible was Mathewe's, in which, as has been mentioned, Coverdale rejected his own translations for Tyndal's.

The following year Coverdale published his Holly-bushe translation from the Vulgate, in which the Latin idiom plainly appears. He now translated these texts in this manner.

And therefore we having so great cloud of witnesses

laid upon us, laying away all the weight and sin that standeth by us, let us run by patience unto the strife that is set before us, looking upon the author and finisher of faith Jesus, which the joy being set afore him, suffered the cross, shame despised *, and sitteth on the right hand of the seat of God †.

I will add the same passage as it stands in the later Bibles, by way of elucidating the gradual improvements made in the translation of the New Testament.

Cranmer's Bible of 1540, copies Mathewe's Bible (that is, here, Tyndal's translation), as usual, with slight corrections; thus, instead of "that hangeth on," Cranmer's Bible has "that hangeth *so fast* on;" and instead of "the *auctor* and finisher," it has "the captain and finisher."

The Geneva Bible has,

Wherefore, *let us also, seeing that we are compassed* with so great a cloud of witnesses, *cast away every thing that presseth down, and the sin that hangeth so fast on:* let us run with patience the race that is set before us,

* In the Vulgate, confusione contemptâ: this is a specimen of the difficulty which Coverdale found in Anglicising the Latin ablative absolute.

A comparison of Coverdale's translation of the above texts, as copied from his Bible, with Tyndal's, inclines me to think, that when Coverdale formed the translation which constitutes the Bible called after him, he consulted Tyndal's New Testament (the first edition of which came out in 1526), but had not the assistance of Tyndal's Pentateuch (published so much later as 1534), in translating the Hebrew Scriptures; and that, out of delicacy to Tyndal, Coverdale made it a point of honour to publish his Bible in 1535, nearly as it stood before he became acquainted with Tyndal.

† Hollybushe's N. Testament, edition of 1538.

looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross *and despised the shame, and is set* at the right hand of the throne of God.

In the authorized Version it stands thus: Wherefore, *seeing we also are compassed about* with so great a cloud of witnesses, *let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and* let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith, who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, *despising the shame, and is set down* at the right hand of the throne of God.

It appears, then, that Tyndal's translation, Coverdale's Bible, and Hollybushe's New Testament, are three different versions; and if Dr. Macknight's information was incorrect, his arguments are strangely illogical, in the passage which immediately follows the words last quoted from him. "It is evident likewise," says he, "that that translation was made from the Vulgate, and "in so literal a manner, that the reader might make "plain construction of the Latin by the English. It is "true, Coverdale in some places corrected the Latin text; "but it was only as a grammarian; and in these correc- "tions he was careful to swerve as little as possible from "his text. *Wherefore Coverdale having assisted Tyndal* "*in making his translation, they followed one and the* "*same method; that is, both of them translated the* "*Scriptures from the Vulgate; both of them translated* "*the Vulgate literally; and both of them corrected the* "*text of the Vulgate as grammarians, making use of* "*other translations for that purpose;* such as for the "Old Testament, the *Septuagint*, Luther's *German*

" Version, and Munster's Latin translation; and for the " New *Wickliffe's*" *(English, observe)* " and Eras- " mus' Versions, and what others they could find *."

I am sorry to see also that Macknight, in his account of Coverdale's Bible, inconsiderately charges that truly humble† translator with a fraud, practised to obtain credit which he did not deserve. He says, Coverdale, " by calling his *a special translation*, wished to have it " considered as different from Tyndal's. Yet it is well " known that he adopted all Tyndal's translations, both " of the O. T. and the New, with some small altera- " tions." Again, " The Books of the Old Testament " and of the Apocrypha which Tyndal had not trans- " lated, are the only translations in Coverdale's Bible, " which are properly his own ‡." These statements are entirely untrue, and are the result of his mistake in supposing, that Mathewe's Bible was but a second edition of Coverdale's.

* Macknight's Gen. Preface, note to § 2d, p. 19, edition 2d.

† Literary men will duly appreciate the humility of Coverdale; who, after having made the best translation of the whole Bible which his industry and acquirements could enable him to produce, was not only content to suppress it, whilst he hoped that a better might be published; to print it afterwards, with a confession of its inferiority to what Tyndal would yet, he hoped, produce; to reject again as worthless, all of his own labours that came in competition with Tyndal's; but could submit to become the author of an avowedly worse translation (viz. Hollybushe's N. T.), restricted to the Vulgate as its original; careless of his character as a writer, provided only he might gain souls to Christ.

It is painful to find a divine who knew nothing of his works but by the report of others, charging him with a very pitiful kind of vanity.

‡ Macknight's Gen. Preface, p. 16, 17.

In another place he says, "It appears likewise, that "Tyndal and Coverdale's translation, of which the rest "are copies, was not made from the originals, but from "the Vulgate Latin *."

Lastly, the conclusion which the Bishop of Peterborough has done Dr. Macknight the honour of inserting in his Lectures, is made by its author to rest on a chain of mistakes. "If," says he, "Tyndal and Coverdale's "translation was made from the Vulgate Latin; and *if* "the subsequent English translations as they have been "called, were only corrected editions of their Version; "and *if* the corrections made from time to time in the "different editions, respected the language more than "the sense, is it to be thought strange, that many of the "errors of that translation, especially those copied from "the Vulgate, have been continued ever since in all the "editions of the English Bible? Even that which is "called *the King's Translation*, though, in general, "much better than the rest, being radically the same, is "not a little faulty, as it was not thoroughly and im-"partially corrected by the revisers. It is, therefore, by "no means, such a just representation of the inspired "originals, as merits to be implicitly relied on, for "determining the controverted articles of the Christian "faith, and for quieting the dissensions which have "rent the Church †."

In reply to this I shall refer to the collations already given in my Letter, as affording incontestable proofs, that even Coverdale's translation (speaking of that in his Bible) was not made from the Vulgate Latin only, and Tyndal's

* Macknight's Gen. Preface, p. 28.

† Ibid. p. 29.

not at all: that of the subsequent English Bibles, the Geneva, and the authorized Version, are properly called translations, and very different from mere corrected editions of Tyndal and Coverdale: that it cannot properly be said of even the slight corrections which distinguished Cranmer's or the Bishops' Bible, that "they "respected the language more than the sense;" and lastly, that the King's translation is very far from being "radi- "cally the same," as any version made from the Vulgate.

THE END.

S. Gosnell, Printer, 8, Little Queen Street, London.